Adams Library

THE

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES

OF THE

WEALTH OF NATIONS,

ILLUSTRATED,

IN OPPOSITION TO SOME FALSE DOCTRINES

OF

DR. ADAM SMITH, AND OTHERS.

——————— Aratro,
Dignus Honos. VIRGIL.

To labour diligently, and be content, is a sweet life.
ECCLESIAST.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. BECKET, PALL-MALL.

1797.

THE

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES

OF THE

WEALTH OF NATIONS,

ILLUSTRATED, &c.

THE cauſes of the wealth of nations are various, ay even infinite; for it is out of the power of any an, or of any number of men to enumerate every inute circumſtance that may ſerve to promote the roſperity of a ſtate. He that employs his time in ollecting linen rags for the uſe of the paper maker, ontributes to the wealth of his country. He that making planks ſubſtituted the ſaw for the hatchet, d he that ſubſtituted carts and waggons for ſledges d pack-horſes, were great benefactors to mankind, d in this view were entitled to as much praiſe and much recompence as the moſt ſucceſsful general. ſhort, every perſon in ſociety, who prefers honeſt duſtry to idleneſs, promotes in ſome degree the ealth of the nation.

The prudent ſtateſman, ſenſible that it would be preſumptuous and vain attempt to trace out the illion of ſmall cauſes that contribute to the wealth nations, applies his attention chiefly to the prin-

cipal and moſt eſſential cauſes, and aſſiduouſly endeavours to render theſe cauſes as efficient as poſſible.

The principal and moſt eſſential cauſe of the proſperity of a ſtate is the ingenuity and labour of its inhabitants exerciſed upon the fertility of its ſoil. All other cauſes of the proſperity of a ſtate united, are not equivalent to this; and it alone affords that revenue upon which a ſtate is to ſubſiſt and accumulate wealth. This truth, Mr. Locke contented himſelf with ſlightly touching upon; and ſince his time Vanderlint, and ſome other Engliſh political writers, have beſtowed ſome notice upon it. But of late years it has been very ſyſtematically though not correctly, illuſtrated by many celebrated French writers, who on that account are diſtinguiſhed by the name of Political Economiſts. Dr Adam Smith in his work, entitled an Enquiry into the Nature and Cauſes of the Wealth of Nations has in my opinion given, (except in one point) a fair and accurate view of the great outlines of that ſyſtem, according to the French writers, with the purpoſe of objecting to ſome material parts of it. As I mean in my preſent diſcourſe to eſtabliſh that ſyſtem, and to correct the errors of the French Economiſts, and of Dr. Adam Smith, it becomes neceſſary for me to lay before my readers, its leading doctrines according to the French writers, which I ſhall endeavour to do, with as much brevity as is conſiſtent with diſtinctneſs.

According to the French Economiſts, the different orders of people who contribute in any reſpect to

ward

wards the annual revenue of a country are, firſt, the proprietors of land; ſecondly, the cultivators, whom they honour with the peculiar appellation of the productive claſs; and thirdly, artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, whom they degrade, by the humiliating appellation of the barren or unproductive claſs.

The proprietors contribute to the annual revenue, by what they may occaſionally lay out upon the improvement of the land, by which the cultivators are enabled with the ſame capital to raiſe a greater produce. The cultivators or farmers, who form the ſecond claſs, contribute to the annual produce, firſt by their ſtock, and ſecondly by their annual labour and expenditure; for without ſtock, and without daily labour and expence, the farm would not produce. The farm ought to produce to the farmer a reaſonable profit upon both thoſe capitals, and over and above a ſurplus produce, which goes to the landlord under the name of rent; and on account of both theſe profits, this claſs is diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of the productive claſs. 'Till the landlord receives a reaſonable profit upon the primary expences, and the farmer likewiſe a reaſonable profit upon his ſtock and expence, neither the church nor the king can take any thing without occaſioning a diminution of the produce of ſucceeding years.

The original and the annual expences laid out in cultivating the ſoil, are conſidered as the only productive expences. All other expences are in their eſtimation barren or unproductive; conſe-

quently artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, the third order of men, whoſe labour only replaces the revenue which they conſume, are called barren or unproductive. The expence laid out in employing and maintaining them does no more than continue the exiſtence of its own value, and is therefore unproductive. The wealth of ſociety can never in the ſmalleſt degree be augmented by artificers, manufacturers, or merchants, otherwiſe than by their ſaving and accumulating part of what is intended for their daily ſubſiſtence; conſequently it is by privation or parſimony alone, that they can add any thing to the general ſtock. Cultivators, on the contrary, may live up to the whole of their income, and yet at the ſame time greatly enrich the ſtate; for their induſtry affords a ſurplus produce called rent. Nations therefore that like France and England conſiſt in a great meaſure of proprietors and cultivators, can be enriched by induſtry and enjoyment. But nations which, like Holland and Hamburg, are compoſed chiefly of merchants, manufacturers, and artificers, can grow rich only through parſimony and privation.

The unproductive claſs however is greatly uſeful to the claſſes of proprietors and cultivators, for by means of the induſtry of that claſs the latter can purchaſe manufactures, either foreign or domeſtic, with a much ſmaller quantity of their own labour, than if they were to ſlacken in their attention to cultivation, and to attempt either to manufacture or to import them themſelves. The induſtry of merchants, artificers, and manufacturers, though in its

its own nature altogether unproductive, yet contributes in this manner indirectly to increaſe the produce of the land. It will always be the intereſt of the cultivators and proprietors to encourage the induſtry of the unproductive claſs, becauſe from that encouragement, competition will ariſe, and conſequently more induſtry will be procured with leſs recompence; that is, things will become cheaper. It will likewiſe always be the intereſt of the unproductive claſs to encourage cultivators, becauſe the greater the produce which they draw from the ground, the greater will be the employment of that claſs. The eſtabliſhment of perfect juſtice, of perfect liberty, and of a perfect equilibrium, is the very ſimple ſecret, which moſt effectually ſecures the higheſt degree of proſperity to all the three claſſes.

Should a nation of proprietors and cultivators have in the beginning neither artificers, manufacturers, nor merchants, within its own territory, yet it would be found policy in that nation to admit foreign manufactures free of all duties whatever, becauſe it would thereby purchaſe them with a leſs quantity of its own produce, and conſequently would have a greater ſurplus produce, which in progreſs of time, when its lands were all brought into cultivation, would ſerve as a capital for the employment of artificers and manufacturers at home. Theſe manufacturers though at firſt probably unſkilful, yet by having it in their power to ſell their manufactures cheaper than foreigners could, who brought them from a great diſtance, would in time be able not only to ſupply their own nation, without

any foreign importation, but to carry their own manufactured goods abroad at a cheaper rate than a mere mercantile nation could afford them. But till its lands be all cultivated, it gains more by employing its capital in the cultivation of its lands, than in promoting manufacturing induſtry; for the former gives a real increaſe, or renewal of revenue, which the laſt does not.

This ſyſtem has truth and nature for its foundation; but the French writers not having gone quite to the foundation, have conſequently not given ſuch an explanation of it as is altogether juſt and accurate. Had the French writers traced the Economical ſyſtem to its foundation, they could not have deemed Receivers of land rents, as mere Receivers of rents, a productive claſs in ſociety. What made them ſtop ſhort in their inveſtigations, I ſhall not pretend to ſay; but they have in ſome degree compenſated for their error by intimating that the Church and King are to be ſerved out of thoſe rents. Dr. Smith, however, not perceiving the error of the French writers; but on the contrary, ſuffering it (ſeemingly as an engraftment from them) to pervade the whole of his own enquiry, directs his refutation to the ſound part of the Economical ſyſtem.

Let us now examine in what manner he combats this ſyſtem. His introductory remark is as follows. 'The capital error of this ſyſtem ſeems to lie in its 'repreſenting the claſs of Artificers, Manufacturers, 'and Merchants, as altogether barren and unpro-'ductive. The following obſervations may ſerve 'to ſhew the impropriety of this obſervation.'

Now

Now what Dr. Smith apprehends to be the capital error of this ſyſtem, I hope to be able moſt ſatisfactorily to prove to be no error, but a well-founded truth of great political importance. The Economiſts we have ſeen affirm, that no part of the revenue of ſociety ariſes from manufactures; and as the diſcuſſing the validity of Dr. Smith's obſervations affords me an opportunity not only of eſtabliſhing this truth, but at the ſame time of ſhewing that the revenue of ſociety ariſes ſolely from the induſtry of the inhabitants, beſtowed upon the fertility of the ſoil, I ſhall therefore proceed to the conſideration of the Doctor's obſervations. The firſt obſervation is in the following words:—'Firſt, this claſs (meaning the claſs of manufacturers) it is acknowledged 'reproduces, annually, the value of its own annual 'conſumption, and continues at leaſt the exiſtence 'of the ſtock or capital which maintains and employs it. But upon this account alone the denomination of barren or unproductive, ſhould ſeem 'to be very improperly applied to it. We ſhould 'not call a marriage barren or unproductive, though 'it produced only a ſon and a daughter, to replace 'the father and mother, and though it did not increaſe the number of the human ſpecies; but 'only continued it as before. Farmers and country 'labourers, indeed, over and above the ſtock which 'maintains and employs them, reproduce annually 'a neat produce, a free rent to the landlord. As a 'marriage which affords three children is certainly 'more productive than one which affords only two, 'ſo the labour of farmers and country labourers is

'certainly

'certainly more productive than that of merchants, 'artificers, and manufacturers. The ſuperior pro- 'duce of the one claſs, however, does not render 'the other barren or unproductive.'

The whole of this obſervation of Dr. Smith is nothing but an evaſive quibble about the accurate meaning of the word *barren;* and the compariſon he has introduced of a marriage, ſhews moſt appoſitely the fallacy of his concluſion, and eſtabliſhes the great propriety and juſtneſs of the ſenſe given by the Economiſts to the word barren, that is, *not yielding any increaſe*. The mother of two children certainly could not be called barren; but a marriage that produced only two children may with the utmoſt propriety be called barren. If for every child that was born, an adult perſon died, would a deſart country ever become populous? Were this to be the caſe in Botany Bay, and were no new inhabitants to be imported thither, would New Holland ever become a peopled country? Were I to ſow 20 buſhels of wheat in a field, and at harveſt it ſhould only produce 20 buſhels, might it not, with the greateſt propriety, be called a barren field? I ſuſpect it would be deemed ſo by every one, and be deſerted accordingly. If this field has produced 20 buſhels, ſome vegetation has appeared in it, *but no increaſe;* for 20 buſhels were thrown into it. Therefore a claſs of men whoſe labour (though it produces ſomething) produces no more than what was beſtowed, in order to effect that labour, may with the greateſt propriety be called an *unproductive claſs*. It would be waſting my readers time, to beſtow more words

upon this firſt obſervation. I ſhall proceed to the ſecond.

'Secondly, it ſeems upon this account altogether 'improper to conſider artificers, manufacturers, and 'merchants, in the ſame light as menial ſervants. 'The labour of menial ſervants does not continue 'the exiſtence of the fund which maintains and 'employs them. Their maintenance and employment are altogether at the expence of their maſters, 'and the work which they perform is not of a nature to repay that expence. That work conſiſts 'in ſervices which periſh generally in the very inſtant of their performance, and does not fix or realize itſelf in any vendible commodity which can 'replace the value of their wages or maintenance. 'The labour, on the contrary, of artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, naturally does fix and 'realize itſelf in ſome ſuch vendible commodity. 'It is upon this account that, in the chapter in 'which I treat of productive and unproductive labour, I have claſſed artificers, manufacturers, and 'merchants, among the productive labourers, and 'menial ſervants among the barren or unproductive.'

I muſt begin with remarking, that Dr. Smith, in putting the labour of menial ſervants upon the ſame footing with the labour of artificers and manufacturers, has actually miſſtated the doctrine of the Economiſts; and in this point only, as I have before noticed. The Economiſts make a diſtinction between the labour that yields an equivalent for expenditure, and the labour that yields no equivalent. This laſt is the labour of menial ſervants, and

the

the firſt that of artificers and manufacturers; but ſtill they both are with the greateſt propriety termed unproductive; though the one be much more ſo than the other. I ſhall explain the difference in a few words. It will be allowed, that a field which returns only the ſeed ſown into it, is a barren field. But ſome ground, ſuch as the ſea beach, may poſſeſs no vegetative power at all, and may not even return the ſeed ſown into it, conſequently would be much more barren than the other. The labour of menial ſervants is aptly compared to this very ſterile ground. But will the greater ſterility of one ſpot entitle ground to be called productive, that actually returns only the ſeed, but gives no increaſe? This difference is only a greater or leſs degree of a *minus*; but will never give a *plus*. The Economiſts moſt readily allow that the labour of artificers and manufacturers fixes itſelf; which the labour of menial ſervants does not. But from thence does it follow, with any ſhadow of logick, that the former yields the ſmalleſt increaſe, and conſequently can be called productive. Upon this falſe induction, however, Dr. Smith ſays, 'It is upon this account that, 'in the chapter in which I treat of productive and 'unproductive labour, I have claſſed artificers, ma-'nufacturers, and merchants, among the produc-'tive labourers, and menial ſervants among the 'barren and unproductive.' Has he done ſo on this account? Then, I ſay, having no other account, he has actually by theſe words declared a very large portion of his own treatiſe fallacious; for the error of deeming that productive which is thus plainly proved

proved to be unproductive, pervades much more than one chapter of his work.

In his third obſervation Dr. Smith puſhes the point a little further, and attempts to ſhew that the labour of artificers and manufacturers does not only give an equivalent for the conſumption it occaſions, but even yields an increaſe. ‘ Thirdly,’ he ſays, ‘ it ſeems upon every ſuppoſition improper to ſay, ‘ that the labour of artificers, manufacturers, and ‘ merchants, does not increaſe the real revenue of the ‘ ſociety. Though we ſhould ſuppoſe, for example, ‘ as it ſeems to be ſuppoſed in this ſyſtem, that the ‘ value of the daily, monthly, and yearly conſump- ‘ tion of this claſs was exactly equal to that of its ‘ daily, monthly, and yearly production, yet it ‘ would not from thence follow that its labour added ‘ nothing to the real revenue, to the real value of ‘ the annual produce of the land and labour of the ‘ ſociety. An artificer, for example, who in the ‘ firſt ſix months after harveſt, executes ten pounds ‘ worth of work, though he ſhould, in the ſame ‘ time, conſume ten pounds worth of corn and ‘ other neceſſaries, yet really adds the value of ten ‘ pounds to the annual produce of the land and la- ‘ bour of the ſociety. While he has been con- ‘ ſuming a half yearly revenue of ten pounds worth ‘ of corn and other neceſſaries, he has produced an ‘ equal value of work, capable of purchaſing either ‘ to himſelf, or to ſome other perſon, an equal half ‘ yearly revenue. The value therefore of what has ‘ been conſumed and produced, during theſe ſix ‘ months, is equal not to ten, but to twenty pounds.

‘ It

'It is poſſible, indeed, that no more than ten 'pounds worth of this value, may ever have exiſted 'at any one moment of time. But if the ten 'pounds worth of corn and other neceſſaries, which 'were conſumed by the artificer, had been con-'ſumed by a ſoldier, or by a menial ſervant, the 'value of that part of the annual produce which 'exiſted at the end of ſix months, would have 'been ten pounds leſs than it actually is, in conſe-'quence of the labour of the artificer. Though 'the value of what the artificer produces therefore, 'ſhould not, at any one moment of time, be ſup-'poſed greater than the value he conſumes, yet at 'every moment of time the actually exiſting value 'of goods in the market is, in conſequence of what 'he produces, greater than it otherwiſe would be.'

'When the patrons of this ſyſtem aſſert that the 'conſumption of artificers, manufacturers, and 'merchants, is equal to the value of what they pro-'duce, they probably mean no more than that 'their revenue, or the fund deſtined for their con-'ſumption is equal to it. But if they had ex-'preſſed themſelves more accurately, and only aſ-'ſerted that the revenue of this claſs was equal to 'the value of what they produced, it might readily 'have occurred to the reader, that what would na-'turally have been ſaved out of this revenue, muſt 'neceſſarily increaſe more or leſs the real wealth of 'the ſociety. In order therefore to make out ſome-'thing like an argument, it was neceſſary that they 'ſhould expreſs themſelves as they have done; and 'this argument, even ſuppoſing things actually

'were

' were as it ſeems to preſume them to be, turns out ' to be a very inconcluſive one.'

I chooſe to give Dr. Smith's arguments without any abridgment, though they would loſe nothing in being expreſſed in fewer words. His verboſeneſs and ambiguity clearly ſhew how a man of ability, when overlooking fundamental principles, may ſpeculate upon the ſurface of things, without ever getting at the kernel. In this third obſervation we have what, in mercantile accounts, is called a ſecond entry, that is, the ſame articles ſtated twice in the ſame account, which muſt neceſſarily occaſion a falſe aggregate, or falſe concluſion. ' While an ar- ' tificer,' he ſays, ' has been conſuming a half yearly ' revenue of ten pounds worth of corn, and other ' neceſſaries, he has produced an equal value of ' work capable of purchaſing either to himſelf, or ' to ſome other perſon, an equal half yearly reve- ' nue. The value therefore of what has been con- ' ſumed and produced, during theſe ſix months, is ' equal not to ten, but to twenty pounds.' Were this true, artificers and manufacturers would certainly be a productive claſs. But in ſtating the caſe with preciſion, which the Doctor has not done, it will appear that this hocus pocus manner of turning ten into twenty, is like legerdemain tricks in general, a mere deception. The artificer, he means to ſay, who produces a piece of manufacture, after half a year's work, may ſell it for as much as will maintain him a ſecond half year; conſequently, though he has conſumed only what fed him ſix months, he may get, by his manufacture, what will feed him twelve

twelve months. It has totally eſcaped Dr. Smith, that the artificer had no right to ſell his manufacture, as it was previouſly mortgaged to pay for his firſt ſix months proviſions; for it cannot be preſumed that his firſt ſix months proviſions were given to him gratis. He that furniſhed thoſe proviſions to him muſt be reimburſed; and how is he to be reimburſed? By the piece of manufacture. Conſequently the ten pounds ſtill remain ten pounds. I will ſtate a caſe analogous, and ſimilar to that mentioned by Dr. Smith, which will render his falſe concluſion ſtill clearer to my reader. Suppoſe a farmer has a deſire for a good clock, and meeting with a ſkilful clock-maker, juſt come out of priſon, without a farthing in his pocket, agrees with him on the following terms, namely, to furniſh him with proviſions, materials and tools, till he finiſh the clock, and to have the clock in return. Would not the clock-maker be deemed a diſhoneſt perſon, or a fool, if he attempted to diſpoſe of the clock to any other perſon but the farmer who furniſhed him with proviſions.

It is, I think, unneceſſary to enlarge further in the refutation of the third obſervation. I ſhall only remark, that the ſecond argument, that the artificer by his labour muſt create an increaſe of value, becauſe the menial ſervant does not, is equally inconcluſive as the firſt, and has already been anſwered.

I proceed to his fourth obſervation, which is in the following words: 'Fourthly, farmers and coun-'try labourers can no more augment, without parſi-'mony, the real revenue, the annual produce of the land

' land and labour of their ſociety, than artificers,
' manufacturers, and merchants. The annual pro-
' duce of the land and labour of any ſociety can
' be augmented only in two ways; either, firſt, by
' ſome improvement in the productive powers of
' the uſeful labour actually maintained within it;
' or, ſecondly, by ſome increaſe in the quantity of
' that labour.'

' The improvement in the productive powers of
' uſeful labour depends, firſt, upon the improve-
' ment in the ability of the workman; and, ſe-
' condly, upon that of the machinery with which
' he works. But the labour of artificers and ma-
' nufacturers, as it is capable of being more ſubdi-
' vided, and the labour of each workman reduced
' to a greater ſimplicity of operation, than that of
' farmers and country labourers, ſo it is likewiſe
' capable of both theſe ſorts of improvement in a
' much higher degree. In this reſpect, therefore,
' the claſs of cultivators can have no ſort of advan-
' tage over that of artificers and manufacturers.'

' The increaſe in the quantity of uſeful labour
' actually employed within any ſociety, muſt depend
' altogether upon the increaſe of the capital which
' employs it; and the increaſe of that capital again
' muſt be exactly equal to the amount of the ſa-
' vings from the revenue; either of the particular
' perſons who manage and direct the employment of
' that capital, or of ſome other perſons who lend it
' to them. If merchants, artificers, and manufac-
' turers are, as this ſyſtem ſeems to ſuppoſe, natu-
' rally more inclined to parſimony and ſaving than

' proprietors and cultivators, they are ſo far, more ' likely to augment the quantity of uſeful labour ' employed within their ſociety, and, conſequently, ' to increaſe its real revenue, the annual produce of ' its land and labour.'

Here we have another miſconception of the doctrine of the Economiſts. The *augmentation* of revenue is not, but indirectly, the object of the Economiſts, though that would be a conſequence of their ſyſtem. Their object is the *production* and *reproduction* of a revenue, which, they affirm, ſolely ariſes from the ingenuity and labour of man exerciſed upon the fertility of the ſoil. The people of Great Britain, for example, are ſuch great ſpenders, that they actually waſte and conſume to the amount of more than eighty millions ſterling annually, and the Britiſh farmers are ſo kind to them as annually to *reproduce* the value of the millions ſpent. Were the farmers to neglect their annual labour, and no ſupplies were to come from abroad, there would not be a living ſoul in Great Britain in fifteen or ſixteen months after. A hard froſt of three or four weeks continuance, we ſee, fills the ſtreets of London with the poor gardeners begging for a ſubſiſtence, as their revenue is then cut off. From this we may draw a concluſion what would be the national miſery on the ſuppoſition of a twelve-months froſt. The cattle of the farmers would ſoon be ſlaughtered or periſh. Every horſe would die. The landlords receiving no rents would diſmiſs all their domeſtics, who finding none to employ them, muſt ſtarve or quit the kingdom. The far-

mers

ners and landlords having no income could not pay taxes; would alſo ceaſe being cuſtomers to the ſhop-keepers, and could not give employment to carpenters, maſons, painters, ſculptors, gilders, ſhoemakers, taylors, &c. all of whom would gradually ceaſe being buyers, and thus the miſery would deſcend from the firſt ranks to the laſt, till the means of ſubſiſtence ceaſed to all. The ſuppoſition of a twelvemonths froſt, I acknowledge, ſeems rather an improbable ſuppoſition. But hiſtory gives us what may be reckoned nearly equivalent to it, and records alſo the conſequence, namely, extreme miſery. We are told that in Judea no rain fell for above three years, and that the people, in conſequence of it, were periſhing with famine. Mr. Thunberg, a late Swediſh traveller, informs us likewiſe, that in one of the Cape de Verd Iſlands, it had not rained for three years, and that it was impoſſible to deſcribe the miſery of the inhabitants. It is not worth while to unravel the inconcluſive obſcurities of the reſt of this obſervation, which is brought in as ſubſidiary to the firſt miſconception, as they ſtand and fall together.

Dr. Smith's fifth and laſt obſervation is in the following words: 'Though the revenue of the inhabitants of every country was ſuppoſed to conſiſt altogether, as this ſyſtem ſeems to ſuppoſe, in the quantity of ſubſiſtence which their induſtry could procure to them; yet even upon this ſuppoſition, the revenue of a trading and manufacturing country muſt, other things being equal, always be much greater than that of one without

' trade and manufactures. By means of trade and
' manufactures, a greater quantity of ſubſiſtence
' can be annually imported into a particular coun-
' try than what its own lands, in the actual ſtate
' of their cultivation, could afford. The inhabi-
' tants of a town, though they frequently poſſeſs
' no lands of their own, yet draw to themſelves by
' their induſtry ſuch a quantity of the rude produce
' of the lands of other people, as ſupplies them not
' only with the materials of their work, but with
' the fund of their ſubſiſtence. What a town al-
' ways is with regard to the country and its neigh-
' bourhood, one independent ſtate or country may
' frequently be with regard to other independent
' ſtates or countries. It is thus that Holland draws
' a great part of its ſubſiſtence from other countries;
' live cattle from Holſtein and Jutland, and corn
' from almoſt all the different countries of Europe.
' A ſmall quantity of manufactured produce pur-
' chaſes a great quantity of rude produce. A tra-
' ding and manufacturing country, therefore, natu-
' rally purchaſes with a ſmall part of its manufactured
' produce a great part of the rude produce of other
' countries; while, on the contrary, a country with-
' out trade and manufactures is generally obliged to
' purchaſe at the expence of a great part of its
' rude produce, a very ſmall part of the manufac-
' tured produce of other countries. The one ex-
' ports what can ſubſiſt and accommodate but a
' very few, and imports the ſubſiſtence and accom-
' modation of a great number. The other exports
' the accommodation and ſubſiſtence of a great

'number, and imports that of a very few only. 'The inhabitants of the one muſt always enjoy a 'much greater quantity of ſubſiſtence than what 'their own lands, in the actual ſtate of their culti-'vation, could afford. The inhabitants of the 'other muſt always enjoy a much ſmaller quantity.'

The ſame miſconception and inconcluſiveneſs run through this obſervation as through the preceding. Were the nature of men the ſame as that of foreſt horſes, who require neither clothing nor houſes, artificers and manufacturers would have no place among them, and cultivators of the ground would be alone required. But as the nature of man differs from that of foreſt horſes, artificers and manufacturers are altogether neceſſary to him; and who can doubt but that it is better for any ſociety which has brought its lands to a high degree of cultivation, to have thoſe artificers and manufacturers reſiding within its own territory than without that territory. A naſcent ſtate has juſt as much need of manufactures as an adult ſtate; but while it can with little labour draw a great revenue from its lands, and while foreign commerce exiſts among men, it will draw thoſe manufactures to itſelf from the diſtance of a thouſand miles at a cheaper rate than if they were to be made at home. In an adult ſtate lands not yielding ſuch a ſurplus of revenue after the expence of cultivation is deducted, the profit from handicrafts and the allurements of ſociety attract in a greater degree the attention of men; and conſequently artificers increaſe, and villages commence, which by degrees ſwell into towns.

A nation then may be ſaid to become more robuſt, when it abounds with manufacturers as well as cultivators; for manufacturers are in fact a military corps de reſerve, and, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, a granary of ſoldiers. This enables an adult ſtate to be powerful in defending itſelf; but a naſcent ſtate having no ſuch corps de reſerve is feeble in ſelf defence, without foreign aid; but to counterbalance this, it, like man in an infant ſtate, grows faſter, is not ſo quarrelſome, and huſbands its ſtrength. While the artificers and manufacturers continue their peaceable employments they are fed by the cultivators, and while they are ſoldiers they are likewiſe fed by the cultivators; in the former caſe they return clothing, and the ſupply of the other neceſſary wants of man; and in the latter they return defence; but in either caſe their labour is only an equivalent for their feeding, and no increaſe of revenue.

If the produce of their labour is to be exported, and their feeding imported, the former, Dr. Smith alleges, may more than purchaſe the latter, conſequently may yield a revenue. Dr. Smith has here broke bounds, and, contrary to his own plan, has ſtepped out of the agricultural ſyſtem into the commercial ſyſtem. But when the queſtion is about the production of a revenue, it is altogether illogical to ſubſtitute for that the transfer of a revenue, which all commercial dealings are merely reſolvable into. Whatever be the advantage accruing from exports and imports, that advantage is not an increaſe of revenue, but a transfer of revenue from

A to

A to B. Should a Jew ſell a crown-piece for ten ſhillings, or a Queen Anne's farthing for a guinea, he would augment his own income, no doubt, but he would not thereby augment the quantity of the precious metals; and the nature of the traffic would be the ſame, whether his virtuoſo cuſtomer reſided in the ſame ſtreet with himſelf, or in France, or in China. What does the word *commerce* imply, but *commutatio mercium*, an interchange of revenues already created, which moſt frequently is for the mutual benefit of both dealers, though ſometimes more beneficial to the one than the other; but ſtill what the one gains the other loſes, and their traffic really produces no increaſe.

But ſetting aſide the great impropriety of thus changing the ſtate of the queſtion, the Economiſt is ready to meet Dr. Smith upon his new ground. If we are to take into conſideration the profits from foreign commerce, it will be generally acknowledged, that when any two nations interchange their ſuperfluity, or merchandize with each other, that nation which produces its ſuperfluity with the leaſt expence, will, other things being equal, draw the greateſt profit from the ſale of that ſuperfluity. Now in a nation poſſeſſing a fertile territory, the production of corn, including in that word the other neceſſary articles of ſubſiſtence, is leſs expenſive than the fabrication of manufactures, conſequently the exportation of corn is of all other exportations the moſt profitable to ſuch a nation.

The compariſon of the profit ariſing from cultivation with the profit ariſing from fabrication, is of

ſo great importance, and ſo little attended to by thoſe whoſe minds are wholly intent upon manufactures and foreign commerce, that it merits a particular illuſtration.

Suppoſe a gentleman has four favourite ſervants, a man and his wife, with their two ſons, all capable of labour, and places them in one of his old manſions, with an allowance of ten pounds a year to each for ſubſiſtence, 'tis plain they would be an annual charge of 40 pounds to that gentleman. But ſuppoſe thoſe ſame four perſons to get poſſeſſion of 50 acres of good ſoil, which they wiſh to cultivate, but having no capital are obliged to borrow every thing. The ſame friendly gentleman, inſtead of *giving* them this year 40l. *lends* them 40l. and alſo *lends* them 90 buſhels of ſeed, a plough, harrows, ſickles, &c. and the uſe of two horſes. Of the fifty acres they ſow thirty, and being exceedingly induſtrious, from having the full aſſurance that all they ſhall earn will be their own, they in harveſt reap 630 buſhels, or ſeven grains for one. Now computing thoſe buſhels at 630 crowns, or 157 pounds 10 ſhillings, and allowing the profits ariſing from the twenty acres in graſs to pay for the implements, and the hire and keep of the horſes, they are thus by their crop enabled to acquit all their debts. They reimburſe the 40 pounds for their ſubſiſtence, and the value of the ſeed, amounting to 22l. 10s. and allow five per cent intereſt for the loan, making in all 65l. 12s. which leaves them a reſerve, or neat profit of 91l. 18s. In this new ſituation, therefore, inſtead of being a charge to the gentleman, they are a charge to nobody, have by their

their own labour ſubſiſted themſelves, and realized 91l. 18s.

They are now in the ſecond year not under the neceſſity of borrowing; but have a capital of their own fully ſufficient for the ſame enterprize; therefore ſuppoſing the ſame increaſe in their arable fields as before, they will in this ſecond year have raiſed a ſecond income of 157l. 10s. to which (as their farm was this year ſtocked at their own expence) twenty pounds at leaſt muſt be added for the twenty acres in meadow and paſture, making in all 177l. 10s. Deducting from this the expence of the third year's enterprize, or about 62 pounds, and ſuppoſing their farm to be as productive, as in the two preceding years, they will at their third harveſt have realized a ſecond 177l. 10s. to which muſt be added the reſerved capital of their ſecond year, or 112l. 10s. making in all 290 pounds.

Should the corn the cultivators have produced each year, which amounted to the marketable value of 157l. 10s. be ſold abroad, the nation by their induſtry will be a gainer of 91l. 18s. annually. Should it be conſumed at home, four perſons will have thereby ſubſiſted themſelves at nobody's expence, and added to the national capital 91l. 18s. annually.

My reader will doubtleſs have obſerved, that I have omitted mentioning the payment of any rent for the fifty acres. This is a deſigned omiſſion, (for in the above ſtated caſe no payment of any rent is required) as the fifty acres are ſuppoſed to be given by the Supreme Benefactor, who expects no rent

for

for them, but thankfulneſs and obedience to his laws. In fact theſe fifty acres repreſent the ſeventy-three millions of acres poſſeſſed by the inhabitants of Great Britain, who pay no rent to any one for the territory they occupy; and my cultivators, if there had not been room for them in Great Britain, might have ſat down in Kentucky, where they might have had not fifty acres, but one hundred acres, without paying for them any rent whatever. But of the nature of rent I ſhall treat by and by.

Let us now examine the profits accruing to the nation from the exportation of manufactures. It has already been ſhewn that no man, as a manufacturer, however he may gain himſelf, adds any thing to the national revenue, if his commodity is ſold and conſumed at home; for the buyer preciſely loſes not only what the manufacturer gains, but the amount of the wages, and of the price of the raw materials beſides. There is an interchange between the ſeller and the buyer, but no increaſe. Mr. Edwards, in his judicious and elegant hiſtory of the Weſt Indies, ſtates, that annually 22,000,000 pounds weight of cotton is imported into Great Britain, and manufactured into a value of ſeven millions and a half ſterling, by the full employment of 600,000 people. Suppoſe this ſtatement accurate, then deduct one million for the prime coſt of the cotton, and the labouring manufacturers will be found to earn 10l. 16s. each, which is not the half of a ploughman's earnings. From the ſtatiſtical account of Scotland, vol. vii. publiſhed by the very reſpectable Preſident of the Board of Agri-

culture, it appears that in 1784 the manufactures of the town of Paiſley amounted to the value of 579,185l. and gave employment to 26,484 perſons: If from the value of the manufactured commodities, we deduct one-fifth for the price of the raw materials, we ſhall have the ſum of 463,350l. which divided among the above mentioned manufacturers, makes the wages of each amount to 17l. 10s. From Mr. Durnford's Hiſtory of the Town of Tiverton, in Devonſhire, it appears that the total value of the manufactures fabricated there, deducting the price of the raw material, and divided among all the manufacturers, allows to each hardly 10l. a year.

The firſt reflection that ariſes from theſe ſtatements is the ſmallneſs of the earnings of the manufacturers, which are not much more than thoſe of a common foot ſoldier. The ſecond reflection is that there appears to be no ſurplus; for ſmall as the earnings are, yet the aggregate of them all makes up the full value of the fabrications. To ſupply the want of a ſurplus, I ſhall ſuppoſe that the maſter employer takes a profit of 50 per cent upon what he expends in wages, or ſixpence in the ſhilling on each manufacturer's pay; and allowing the average income of each manufacturer to be 16l. a year, that would make the maſter's annual gains upon each four manufacturers 32 pounds; and if the manufacture is ſold abroad, theſe 32 pounds would be the national profit from four artificers. Even in this light the exportation of the labour of four cultivators appears to be 38 per cent more profitable to the

the nation than the exportation of the labour of four artificers.

This concluſion however is doing but half juſtice to the cultivator; for upon a more narrow and accurate inſpection it will be found, that the 32 pounds which the maſter employer is enabled to draw from abroad by the ſale of his manufacture, is not owing ſolely to the four manufacturers, but in part to the cultivators, who fed thoſe manufacturers. Had there been no ſubſiſtence provided, there would have been no work done; and the value of the work done, we have ſeen above, does no more than compenſate for the value of the ſubſiſtence. Therefore to ſend abroad ſuch a value in manufactures as ſhould yield a profit of 32 pounds to the exporter, requires not the labour of four men only, but of ſix men, allowing the ſurplus produce of two cultivators ſufficient to feed four manufacturers. Now if ſix men are neceſſary to the procuring a profit of 32 pounds by the exportation of manufactures, and four men can procure a profit of 91 pounds by the exportation of corn, the national profit from the exportation of the latter exceeds that from the exportation of the former nearly in the proportion of 4 to 1. Mr. Jefferſon of Virginia therefore ſpeaks the language of an enlightened politician when he ſays, ‘ 'Tis for the intereſt of the American States, that for a long time to come their manufacturers ſhould reſide in Europe.’

The preceding reflections, I think, ſuffice to ſhew the falſeneſs of Dr. Smith's poſition, that the exportation of manufactures may create a revenue

to

to a ſtate in preference to the exportation of rude produce. His reaſoning in the reſt of this obſervation, if obſcure ſophiſtry deſerves the name of reaſoning, is equally inconcluſive with what has been refuted. What has *great quantity* and *ſmall quantity* to do in the compariſon of one value with another value. A ſmall bundle of lace will purchaſe many ſackfuls of corn; but the queſtion is, if food be wanted, or even if gold be wanted, whether the manufacturers of that lace would not have drawn more profit to themſelves and to their country, if they had employed themſelves as cultivators, than as manufacturers; and that queſtion having already been reſolved, ſhews the *nomeaning* of the words great quantity and ſmall quantity.

Dr. Smith further ſays, 'The inhabitants of a 'town, though they frequently poſſeſs no lands of 'their own, yet draw to themſelves by their induſ-'try ſuch a quantity of the rude produce of the 'lands of other people as ſupplies them not only 'with the materials of their work, but with the 'fund of their ſubſiſtence.' The very terms of this ſentence diſprove what Dr. Smith wiſhes to prove by it. The inhabitants of a town, he ſays, *draw* to themſelves the *rude produce* of other people. By thus drawing it is evident they do not *create* a revenue, but *transfer* the revenue created by others. Who ever doubted that in traffic one may gain and another may loſe? But where the inquiry is not concerning the ſource of the wealth of individuals, but of the Wealth of Nations, it is rather illogical to ſubſtitute the one for the other. Dr. Smith

Smith not adverting to this paralogiſm goes on: ‘ It is thus,’ he ſays, ‘ that Holland draws a great ‘ part of its ſubſiſtence from other countries; live ‘ cattle from Holſtein and Jutland, and corn from ‘ almoſt all the different ſtates of Europe.’ Now before any thing can be inferred from this, in favour of his ſuppoſition, Dr. Smith ought to have proved, that Denmark and Poland are loſers in ſupplying Holland with beef and corn in return for manufactures. But from what is above written the preſumption is, that the gain is on the ſide of Denmark and Poland, and that theſe kingdoms, while any lands remain in them uncultivated, may adopt the language of Mr. Jefferſon, and ſay, ‘ It is for the ‘ intereſt of Denmark and Poland, that for a long ‘ time to come their manufacturers ſhould reſide in ‘ Holland.’

That the pecuniary wealth of Holland exceeds that of any other European nation has been noticed by many writers; but he muſt not have peruſed hiſtory with much attention who attributes that wealth to the manufactures carried on by the Hollanders. The enquiring Economiſt will find three much more copious ſources of that wealth than manufactures; and two of them that are actually ſources of the natural and real revenue, to which wiſe nations will ever give the preference, namely, territorial improvement and fiſhing. When the Economiſt ſays that the chief ſource of the wealth of nations conſiſts in the labour of man exerciſed upon the fertility of the ſoil, he by no means excludes the fertility of the ſeas, as the ocean, when

ploughed

ploughed by fiſhermen, yields an increaſe frequently as abundant as the land when ploughed by huſbandmen. By this natural ſource of wealth the Dutch were formerly, and ſtill are great gainers. The famous De Witt reckoned that one-fourth of his countrymen were maintained by fiſhing; and the diſtinguiſhed engineer, Thomas Digges, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, who ſpent a conſiderable time in Holland, ſays, 'Fiſhinge onlye being none of the leaſte 'foundations of all their proude townes, built in our 'age.' (See his plan for improving Dover Haven, written about the year 1582, and printed in the Archæologia, vol. II.) Now if the Dutch territory hardly ſuffices to maintain one-half of its inhabitants, and one-fourth of them draw their ſubſiſtence from fiſhing, this is nearly the ſame thing as if their land territory were enlarged one-half, and to be productive of a revenue.

Another ſource of Dutch revenue is likewiſe equivalent to an enlargement of land territory; I mean the monopoly of the ſpices of the Eaſt. Were Great Britain to poſſeſs a monopoly of the growth of potatoes, and finding a great demand for them in other countries, ſhould ſell them at five ſhillings a pound, inſtead of a penny a pound, 'tis plain that one acre of potatoes in that caſe would, in point of mercantile profit, be equal to 60 acres. But ſuch for theſe two hundred years paſt has nearly been the caſe in reſpect to Dutch traffic in nutmegs, cloves, mace, cinnamon, which are at the tables of the luxurious, what gin is at the meals of the indigent. Were the expence of the production or purchaſe of thoſe ſpices in the Eaſt, and the

European

European market prices of them to be compared together, they would be found to differ as widely as the pound of potatoes produced at the expence of one penny, and ſold for five ſhillings, differ from each other; and all that difference is ſo much gain to the monopolizing Dutch, and renders every acre of nutmegs nearly equivalent to 60 acres of corn. Were this monopoly to be permanent, it would be a permanent advantage to the Dutch, an advantage which my readers will perceive is in reſpect to production a natural revenue, but in reſpect to mercantile value, only a revenue transferred, diſtinct however from that ariſing from manufactures.

The third great ſource of the opulence of the Dutch, of which likewiſe they long poſſeſſed a kind of monopoly, and which in its nature is diſtinct from manufactures, is the carrying trade. Their ſhips were ſo many floating warehouſes and retail ſhops, appearing in every quarter of the globe, buying cheap in one nation, and ſelling dear in another, and carrying the wealth thus acquired by transfers of revenue home to their narrow hive at the mouths of the Rhine. Of theſe three ſources of Dutch income; the firſt, namely, the fiſhing, is a real new production; the ſecond, ariſing from the ſale of ſpices, is in part a new production, and in part only a transfer of revenue; and the third is wholly a transfer of a revenue already created, but no new production. Out of theſe three revenues the parſimony of the Dutch has formed a fourth revenue, which however is no new production, but a revenue drawn to themſelves from the revenue of their

their leſs thrifty neighbours. Thus the whole of the preſent land-tax of Kent and Suſſex, and perhaps of Eſſex, belongs to the Dutch, and goes to maintain Dutchmen in Holland, in conſequence of ſums lent by them to the Government of Great Britain. The Dutch having long perſevered in this money lending ſyſtem, which they ſuperadded to their other ſources of income, it is not at all ſurpriſing that, in length of time, they ſhould have accumulated much pecuniary wealth, the precarioufneſs of which however will not impoſe upon the real political Economiſt. During the laſt century the Dutch made ſuch a rapid progreſs towards opulence, that their artificial ſyſtem was regarded by political writers of that age, of no ſmall diſcernment, as far preferable for ſecuring the proſperity of nations, to the poſſeſſion of an extenſive and well cultivated territory. Among thoſe who were dazzled and miſled by the proſperity of the Dutch were Sir William Temple and Sir William Petty, the latter of whom not perceiving upon what a weak and inſecure foundation that proſperity reſted, went ſo far as to wiſh it to be a model for England, ſaying that England would be more rich and more powerful, if Scotland, Ireland, and Wales were ſunk in the ſea, provided their inhabitants were firſt transferred within the bounds of England. Such are the wild and dangerous concluſions that ſenſible men are led into, when the true and fundamental principle of the wealth of nations is not attended to by them, and when in their plans of policy they ſubſtitute

the unſtable and tranſient revenue ariſing from commerce, for the permanent and ſecure revenue ariſing from the cultivation of territory.

How widely different are the maxims of the American States from thoſe of Sir William Petty! Were the Americans to adopt his commercial ſyſtem of getting rich, they might all find room in the peninſula bounded by the Delaware and the Cheſapeak, which, with very little labour, might be made a complete iſland; and there, bounded by the ſea, they might direct their views to commerce and navigation, and by living penuriouſly might acquire, in progreſs of time, a monied capital. They have however wiſely choſen to accumulate men rather than to accumulate ducats; and by giving their chief attention to the moſt valuable of all capitals, an extenſive territory, and by the improvement of that capital, they have acquired more power and more wealth in four years than the Dutch acquired in an hundred years. The increaſe of population in the American States from the year 1790 to 1794, is found by a late cenſus to be 1,321,364 perſons, who eſtimated in a pecuniary light, at the price only of negroes, is an augmentation of national capital of near 100 millions ſterling.

If the ſources of opulence of the Dutch above enumerated (which, as we have ſeen, are not dependent upon manufactures, and which faſcinated the politicians of the laſt century) are inferior, in point of abundance, to the ſource ariſing from the cultivation of an extenſive, a fertile, and connected territory, they are no leſs inferior in point of ſtability. Their fiſhing trade does not now produce one-

one-half of what it formerly produced, becauſe the Swedes, the Britons, the French, the Americans have all interfered in that branch of induſtry. Their Eaſt India monopoly of ſpices is on the point of being terminated, becauſe the climates in the Weſt will ſoon furniſh thoſe ſpices; and their carrying trade has alſo declined from the ſame cauſe that has occaſioned the decline of their fiſhing trade. Now ſuppoſing, what is but too likely, that theſe three ſources of the opulence of the Dutch ſhould ſtill ſuffer a greater wane, and likewiſe that their neighbours, to whom they at preſent ſtand in the light of abſentees, ſhould be wiſe enough to pay them back the money borrowed from them, they would ſoon have the ſad experience that poverty and tenantleſs houſes would overſpread their whole country, notwithſtanding their greateſt ſkill and greateſt induſtry in manufactures.

Are then manufactures of no value to a nation? Very far otherwiſe. What would man in his preſent ſtate be, were he to be without houſes, without clothes, and without furniture. Theſe and a great variety of other kinds of manufactures, are, according to the preſent condition of men, juſtly termed neceſſaries of life; and conſequently manufacturers are moſt deſervedly to be deemed a *neceſſary claſs* in ſociety. That however does not make them a *productive claſs*, that is, a claſs which renews the revenue of ſociety, or gives any augmentation or increaſe to that revenue. The manufacturer becauſe he produces ſomething of value, has been moſt erroneouſly ſuppoſed to augment the

mals of national opulence, to double or triple the value of what is put into his hands, and conſequently to increaſe in the ſame proportion the income of ſociety. Hardly is there any political or commercial writer who has not in ſome degree adopted this error; and among thoſe who have been formerly thus miſled, I muſt include myſelf. But cloſe and frequent meditation on the ſubject has given me the cleareſt conviction that no augmentation of the revenue of ſociety ariſes from the labour of a manufacturer, except in the caſe of its being ſold abroad. In that caſe indeed the profit of the exporter becomes the profit of the nation where he lives. That nation however would, as has been before proved, be a greater gainer, were the labour of the cultivator to be exported rather than the labour of the manufacturer. The manufacturer, almoſt in all caſes, produces ſomething of value to ſociety; but he produces that value only by the extinction of another value, previouſly provided for him by the cultivator. The merit of the manufacturer is, that he gives a fixed and permanent value to the more periſhable riches procured by the cultivator, or rather beſtowed by nature on the labour of the cultivator; but he does not augment that primary and ſole ſource of riches. Thus the beef and bread furniſhed by the cultivator to certain maſons and carpenters have given us Weſtminſter Bridge. The beef and bread are gone, but the bridge we have in exchange. Thus the onions produced by the cultivators in Egypt, and expended by ſome manufacturers there, have given us one of the great pyramids.

mids. Thus the linen manufacturer, at the expence of the ſubſiſtence of his workmen, furniſhed by the cultivator, will turn the flax, furniſhed alſo by the cultivator, into a commodity which is tranſmitted by careful houſewives from one generation to another. Thus the leaves of one mulberry-tree will, through the intervention of ſome ſilk-worms, yield perhaps a guinea's-worth of ſilk; but the increaſe, or revenue, does not originate from the ſilk-worms, but from the mulberry-tree; that is, from the cultivator, aſſiſted by the bounty of nature. The ſilk-worm, in this view, is the exact type of all manufacturers whatever. Having his ſubſiſtence furniſhed to him, he gives in return a permanent commodity, equal in value to that ſubſiſtence.

But do not we ſee many manufacturers get rich? Yes, certainly: and this very circumſtance of their acquiring a capital, has led political and commercial writers into the falſe concluſion, that manufacturers created a capital. In a profeſſed enquiry into the nature and cauſes of the Wealth of Nations, one would have expected to have found this error clearly refuted; but ſo far otherwiſe, Dr. Smith has interwoven it into the whole of his performance, which renders that performance worſe than uſeleſs as a political treatiſe, a mere caſtle of cards, erected without a foundation, and affording no habitation for the politician. If a manufacturer gets rich, or, in Dr. Smith's phraſe, acquires a great capital by the profits of a manufacture, the reſolution of ſuch manufacture into its conſtituent parts, will prove to every perſon open to conviction, that no manufac-

ture when ſold at home, increaſes the income of a nation, however it may add greatly to the conveniences of that nation. Whatever value is put upon any manufacture, it is reſolvable into three other values; namely, the value of the raw material of which it is made, the value of the wages expended in its fabrication, and thirdly, the value or profit which the manufacturer ſuperadds to the other two values, as a recompence to himſelf. Now none of theſe three values comprehends in it any increaſe of general revenue, conſequently the three together cannot form any increaſe of general revenue. They only occaſion a commutation or transfer of the revenue previouſly provided by the cultivator, by giving a permanency to that revenue under a new form. Nay, in ſome caſes (which, indeed, rarely happen) they do not even do that; for we have inſtances wherein the labour of the manufacturer is quite unprofitable both to himſelf and to ſociety. Thus the editor of the poſthumous edition of Lord Bolingbroke's works, would have much better have been doing nothing, than employing himſelf in that publication, by which he loſt ſeveral hundred pounds, becauſe the work did not ſell. Thus the maker of a time-piece which nobody will buy, becauſe it is inaccurate, has actually produced nothing of value, though he may have employed ſeveral years in the conſtruction of it. Thus the calico printer, who unluckily has uſed a pattern that ſuits noboby's taſte, finds by the reſult, that his labour has added no value to the calico. Such caſes, indeed are very rare; but they plainly prove, that a manu-

manufacturer only enriches himſelf by being a ſeller, and that when he ceaſes to be a ſeller, his profits are immediately at a ſtand, becauſe they are not natural profits, but artificial. The cultivator, on the other hand (ſuppoſing a little domeſtic thrift), may exiſt, and thrive, and multiply, without ſelling any thing: conſequently, a nation of cultivators may be a moſt proſperous nation without much exterior traffic.

In the ſame manner as an individual manufacturer gets rich, ſo a manufacturing diſtrict gets rich. It abounds in ſellers, who draw profits to themſelves from the revenues of thoſe to whom they ſell their manufactures. Were the populous manufacturing cities of Great Britain not to be great ſellers (I mean within the limits of Great Britain), they would ſoon dwindle down to the ſize of moderate villages; but as by means of their riders and correſpondents they diſperſe their fabrics through every corner of the iſland, they conſequently concentre profits from every corner of the iſland to their own diſtrict. But all theſe profits, whatever their amount may be, are preciſely ſo much deducted out of the profits of the buyers of thoſe manufactures, conſequently no national income, or augmentation of national revenue. Let it be farther obſerved, that one half of the nation do not ſupply their own wants. Now it is the great praiſe of manufacturers, that they ſupply their own wants; they return a full equivalent for their own ſubſiſtence, which is a moſt material point in their favour, and conſtitutes them one of the eſſential claſſes of ſociety. The

returning this equivalent for their ſubſiſtence, though it does not increaſe any revenue, yet, by rendering the revenue permanent, while half the nation are diſſipating theirs without any return, muſt conſequently fix eaſe and opulence in a manufacturing quarter in a greater degree than in a quarter where neither cultivation nor manual induſtry is much attended to. Suppoſe twenty-four poor females were to have their ſubſiſtence furniſhed to them; and twelve of thoſe females, imitating the practice in Guernſey, ſhould after dinner aſſemble alternately in each other's houſes with their knitting-needles, and ſpend the evenings in converſation and knitting of ſtockings; while the twelve other females after dinner ſit down to cards, and ſpend the evenings in play. Theſe laſt, it is plain, would ever remain in indigence; but the former would in proceſs of time have ſomething to ſell. Nevertheleſs, the value of what they offered to market would only be a retribution of the value of their ſubſiſtence, which by their induſtry they had fixed, while the card-players had diſſipated theirs without any return. Theſe twelve induſtrious females repreſent the whole claſs of manufacturers, who by yielding a return of a permanent nature, equal in value to the ſubſiſtence they conſume, give, by this tranſformation, a certain ſtability to what was before of a more periſhable nature. Thus a cart-load of manufactured cloth may be equivalent to five cart-loads of corn, becauſe it has coſt five cart-loads of corn to pay for the wool and for the wages of the workmen. An additional value it cannot produce,

without

without drawing that additional value from ſome other revenue before created, and therefore yields no increaſe. But ſtill it is a circumſtance extremely in favour of manufacturers, that they do not, like half the nation, eat their bread for nothing, or for an old ſong; but give in return what all nations both civilized and uncivilized have ever deemed neceſſary not only to their well being, but to their very being; conſequently manufacturers have a moſt juſt right to be called an eſſential claſs in ſociety, next after the cultivators. Add to the above, that working manufacturers in towns and villages being accuſtomed to conſider the value of time, are often led to employ their ſpare hours in cultivating a potatoe ſpot, or a ſmall garden, which is a labour that yields an increaſe; and in the populous towns the rich manufacturers, inſtead of a large eſtabliſhment of ſervants, hounds, and horſes, diſpoſe of their ſurplus wealth in building and ornamenting villas, or improving of farms, which places them in the productive claſs of cultivators, and conſequently adds to the wealth of their diſtrict. Laſtly, though manufacturers, by their labour, do not increaſe the revenue or income of a ſtate, yet the demand for their ſubſiſtence encourages the farmers in their neighbourhood to produce that ſubſiſtence, conſequently the lands in ſuch ſituations are generally better cultivated than they would otherwiſe be; and this better cultivation, adds both to the wealth of the diſtrict, and the wealth of the nation. All theſe conſiderations united ſerve to explain how wealth and opulence may be concentered

tered in a manufacturing diſtrict, and how maſter manufacturers may acquire great capitals, though, at the ſame time, manufacturers themſelves do neither originate nor increaſe the income of a nation.

As manufacturers, however, in general, prevent that part of the national income which goes to their ſubſiſtence from being diſſipated, but return it in ſome vendible fabrick, that may be either uſed or ſold, it will be a great object with every wiſe ſtateſman to give every encouragement to increaſe the number of manufacturers, at the expence of ſuch other claſſes in ſociety as are by no means eſſential claſſes. A nation cannot give too much into manufactures, provided it draws its manufacturers from the ſupernumeraries in other claſſes, whoſe ſubſiſtence is in reality a tax upon ſociety. Every one acknowledges that the indigent poor at preſent on the pariſh rolls in Great Britain, who may perhaps exceed 400,000 in number, and who contribute nothing to their own ſubſiſtence, are a tax and burthen upon ſociety; and in ſo far as they are really helpleſs, their ſubſiſtence is a moſt neceſſary and a moſt humane tax. But were one-fourth of their number, or 100,000 of them, to be found capable of manual labour, the eſtabliſhing ſuch regulations as would transfer that fourth into the claſs of manufacturers, would probably ſave a million annually to the nation. The manufacturing claſs in Great Britain might alſo be profitably reinforced from the ſupernumerary and uſeleſs individuals in many other claſſes of ſociety. Were the many ſupernumerary thouſands that could be ſpared from among

among retailing ſhop-keepers, from among ale-houſe-keepers, inn-keepers, apothecaries, attornies, menial ſervants, &c. &c. who are now a much heavier tax upon ſociety than the parochial poor, to be transferred into the claſs of manufacturers, we ſhould ſoon find manufactures more abundant, and at much cheaper prices; that is, the proſperity of the nation would be thereby greatly increaſed, becauſe probably half a million of people, who at preſent are ſubſiſted by the community, without returning to it any equivalent, would in that caſe return the full value of their ſubſiſtence.

A nation, however, would be extremely blind to its own intereſts, who ſhould augment the claſs of manufacturers at the expence of the claſs of cultivators. That would be, in a manner, to neglect the working of a rich gold mine, for the ſake of working a ſilver mine, that did no more than pay the wages of the workmen. The labour of the manufacturer, we have ſeen, is profitable in ſo far as it returns the value of his ſubſiſtence; but the labour of the cultivator not only returns the value of his own ſubſiſtence, but, when ſkilfully applied, and aided by the bounty of nature, yields a ſurplus ſufficient to feed four or five other perſons; conſequently the more numerous the claſs of ſkilful cultivators is in any nation, and the greater the fertility of its ſoil, the greater will be the reſources of that nation. It is the maſs of ſurpluſſes occaſioned by the whole of the cultivators, that forms the revenue of every other claſs in ſociety. It is that which ſets the carpenter and maſon to work; it is that which

pays

pays the ſoldier and ſailor; it is that which enriches the ſhop-keeper; it is that which pays the fees of the lawyer and phyſician. In ſhort, the only ſource of every payment in a ſtate is the produce of its lands and its ſeas, excluſive of the ſmall income it may acquire by foreign commerce, ſmall in compariſon of the immenſity of the other, and often impolitically procured at the expence of that other. What claſs in ſociety ſo much claims the encouragement and ſupport of a wiſe legiſlature as that claſs, which alone originates and increaſes the wealth of ſociety, by furniſhing a ſurplus much beyond its own ſubſiſtence. Thirty hay-makers will in five or ſix days make an hundred pounds worth of hay; a value exceeding their own ſubſiſtence five or ſix fold. Twenty negroes in Carolina will produce as much rice as will purchaſe the labour of an hundred manufacturers in Great Britain. The patriarch Iſaac, we are told, ſowed and reaped an hundred fold, which, allowing even one-half for expence, leaves a neat profit of 5000 per cent. The cultivators of rice in China, it is ſaid, often reap an hundred fold, and have two crops in one year; which, ſuppoſing the ſame degree of expence as before, will give a neat profit of 10,000 per cent. But were the profit of the cultivator, as in leſs fertile climates, to amount only to 400 per cent, or even to 100 per cent, or even but to 50 per cent, it has this advantage over the profits of every other claſs in ſociety *that it is all increaſe*, not being formed by the diminution of the revenue of any other claſs. Nature yields the profit to him, and

through

through him, to the whole community, who have nothing elſe to ſubſiſt upon, excepting perhaps, as above-mentioned, ſome ſmall gains from foreign commerce; which commerce, however, would ſoon ceaſe to exiſt, if it were not for the ſupport of the cultivator.

Since, then, the claſs of cultivators is that alone which originates and increaſes the revenue of a ſtate, a wiſe nation will zealouſly purſue every meaſure that may tend to increaſe the numbers in that claſs, not only from the many uneſſential claſſes in ſociety, but even from the claſs of manufacturers itſelf. Inſtead of making manufactures the attractive principle of cultivation, ſuch a nation will follow the much more natural and more profitable ſyſtem of making cultivation the attractive principle of manufactures. While there is in any corner of its territory lands unimproved, it will advance its proſperity much more rapidly, and eſtabliſh it much more ſolidly, by directing the induſtry of its inhabitants, not to manufactures, but to the cultivation of thoſe lands. The labour of the manufacturer we have ſeen is ſterile or unfruitful in compariſon of that of the cultivator. This laſt, by originating ſubſiſtence, originates and ſupports population; and by originating more than his own ſubſiſtence, creates annually a new fund for purchaſing all the conveniencies that it is in the power of the manufacturer to produce, whether that manufacturer reſides in his own pariſh or ten thouſand miles off, provided the communication, or mutual intercourſe between them, be unobſtructed.

From

From not inveſtigating in what the Wealth of Nations conſiſts, and where it originates, the want of manufactures has been by many writers alleged as an apology for neglected and deficient agriculture. The great cry has been, even among legiſlators themſelves, let us have but manufactures, and then we ſhall have well-cultivated lands. The falſe principle of Dr. Smith, that manufactures produce a revenue, has given ſupport to this very miſleading and pernicious doctrine—a doctrine, indeed, of much older date than that of Dr. Smith's Enquiry. It is, however, with great pleaſure I obſerve, that ſeveral of the authors of the ſtatiſtical account of Scotland, particularly the Rev. Mr. Oliver, in the judicious account of his pariſh of Corſtorphine, view the ſubject in a very different light. Like faithful paſtors, as well as ſkilful politicians, they plainly ſhew, by many judicious arguments, that from motives of religion and morality, as well as from motives of worldly advantage, the cultivation of the territory ought to have the preference to the eſtabliſhment of manufactures, more eſpecially as manufactures are at preſent eſtabliſhed in many parts of Great Britain. Agriculture, I hope, will ſoon be viewed by the whole Britiſh nation, and by the whole Iriſh nation, in the ſame light as it is viewed by thoſe reverend writers; and that it ſhould be ſo viewed, is the great purpoſe of my preſent diſcourſe.

If no national revenue proceeds from manufactures, and if all national revenue proceeds from agriculture, which truths I preſume the preceding pages have made very manifeſt, it may then, I

think, be expected, that the land owners in both iſlands, zealouſly concurring with their reſpective legiſlatures, will without delay adopt ſuch meaſures as may ſpread cultivation over every mountain and over every valley in Great Britain and Ireland. While a field admitting cultivation can be found for every idler, let no idler be without a field. Houſes of induſtry are good things; but fields of induſtry are much better; and were Great Britain and Ireland to be wholly overſpread with ſuch fields, the annual revenue of theſe iſlands would thereby ſoon acquire a real augmentation of twenty millions ſterling. I ſay a real augmentation, and not a nominal. A nominal augmentation only ſerves to heighten prices, to the prejudice of foreign commerce; but a real augmentation would actually lower them, and increaſe both the numbers and the eaſe of the people.

Great Britain and Ireland have the means of this augmentation within themſelves. It may be effected without treaties of commerce; without any acquiſition of new territory, and without any increaſe of the balance of trade. But it cannot be effected unleſs the poſſeſſors of land give every encouragement to thoſe who are willing to undergo the fatigue of cultivating them. From the falſe notion that manufactures are a ſource of wealth, land owners are extremely ready to give perpetual leaſes to manufacturers. But what an overflow of wealth would they not procure to themſelves, and to the nation, would they but ſhew an equal readineſs to give perpetual leaſes to cultivators, from whoſe labours

labours it has been ſhewn, and not from the labours of manufacturers, the Wealth of Nations originates.

Let cultivators have the ſame ſecurity given to them that is laviſhed upon manufacturers, and thouſands and ten thouſands would quickly appear as ready to contract an alliance with their native ſoil, as the vine is to contract an alliance with the lofty poplar. We ſhould then hear of hundreds of thouſands of new marriages between farmers and their farms, no matter whether of great or of ſmall extent, for what is great to the capacity and means of one farmer, may be ſmall to the capacity and means of another. The giving ſecurity to the labourer would give activity to the ſpade and the plough, on every waſte and on every heath in Great Britain. Innumerable buildings would be raiſed by new cultivators, not only along our rivers, our canals, and public roads; but in ſequeſtered places, now inhabited by moor fowl and wild deer. And intermixed with the buildings of thoſe new cultivators, would be the houſes of new manufacturers; ſo that a traveller journeying from ſouth to north, or from eaſt to weſt, would find every where over the whole iſland, a neat habitation within a mile, or within half a mile of another.

A decided preference to cultivation, by no means implies a neglect of manufactures. On the contrary, like natural genius aſſiſted by erudition, *conjurant amice;* they in moſt caſes mutually promote each others proſperity; and would more eſpecially do ſo, if manufacturers, inſtead of being impolitically crowded together in great towns, were every where

where intermixed with the cultivators. By this ſyſtem the unprofitable waſte of expence in tranſporting goods forwards and backwards would be avoided. Manufacturers would every where be near to their ſubſiſtence; and cultivators would no where be obliged to go far from their habitations for the common fabrics they wanted to purchaſe. Above all a virtuous ſimplicity of manners would be preſerved among the people; and while induſtry and content would be every where diffuſed, the land would overflow literally with milk and honey, and the population, the wealth and power of the ſtate reſting on their natural foundation, would gradually riſe to the utmoſt degree of proſperity that the iſland was ſuſceptible of. Such would be the happy conſequences of adopting the ſyſtem of the Economiſts, in conſidering the produce of the ſoil as the ſource of all revenue, and giving the preference to that branch of induſtry, which has for its object the augmentation of that produce.

Having, I think, clearly proved that the revenue of a ſtate ariſes ſolely from the produce of its lands, and that Dr. Smith's arguments in ſupport of the productiveneſs of manufactures are altogether illuſive, I ſhall now proceed to conſider the fundamental error of the French Economiſts in ranking the proprietors of lands as a productive claſs in ſociety; and ſhall explain the principle founded in nature, which when acted upon, renders the proprietors of land, not indeed a productive claſs, but an *eſſential claſs*, and the moſt honourable claſs in ſociety.

In ſo far as a proprietor of land cultivates his own poſſeſſion, or a part of his own poſſeſſion, he certainly ranks among cultivators, and conſequently is one in the productive claſs in ſociety. But when he does not actually interfere with the cultivation of his land, and merely lets it out to be cultivated by others for a certain rent, (which in Europe is the caſe with ninety-nine proprietors in an hundred) it is evident he from that moment ceaſes to be of the productive claſs, and becomes one in the many unproductive claſſes of the community.

Every claſs of men in a ſtate, except the claſs of cultivators, is properly an unproductive claſs. But among the indefinite number of unproductive claſſes ſome are eſſential to the being of a ſtate, while others are wholly uneſſential, though they may be convenient for its well being. What is eſſential to the being of a thing, is that without which the thing itſelf could not exiſt. Thus it is eſſential to gold to be incorruptible, to be yellow, to be very weighty, very mallable, &c. but it is not eſſential to gold to be round or ſquare. To a globe or circle it is eſſential to be round. To a muſket it ſeems eſſential to have a barrel, a lock, a ſtock, and a ramrod; but it is not eſſential to it to have inlaid work or gold or ſilver ornaments. Thus in examining the claſſes in civil ſociety that are eſſential to its very exiſtence, we ſhall find that they may be all reduced to the four following; firſt of all the productive claſs of cultivators; ſecondly, the claſs of manufacturers; thirdly, the claſs of defenders; and fourthly, the

the claſs of inſtructors; for every civil ſociety muſt be fed, muſt be clothed, defended, and inſtructed.

On the ſuppoſition of the Abbé de St. Pierre of *une paix perpetuelle*, or a perpetual peace, the claſs of defenders would ceaſe to be an eſſential claſs in ſociety; and in a ſtate that choſe to be as illiterate as the Romans were before they became acquainted with Grecian literature, or as the Grecians themſelves were till long after the Trojan war, the claſs of inſtructors would alſo ceaſe to be an eſſential claſs. But as the corrupt nature of man renders defence abſolutely neceſſary; and as his mental improvement ought no leſs to be an object with him than his corporeal conveniences and enjoyments, the claſſes of defenders and inſtructors are as juſtly entitled to be deemed eſſential as the claſſes of cultivators and manufacturers, and I have therefore mentioned them as ſuch, though the claſs of cultivators be the only productive claſs.

The proprietors of land as mere receivers of land rents are not an eſſential claſs in ſociety, any more than engravers, ſtatuaries, &c. It is by the conſtitutional appropriation of the rents of land to the defence of the ſtate, that the receivers of thoſe rents become an eſſential claſs in ſociety. By ſeparating the rents of lands from the conſtitutional purpoſe of the defence of the ſtate, the receivers of thoſe rents inſtead of being an eſſential claſs, render themſelves one of the moſt uneſſential and moſt burdenſome claſſes in ſociety. This fundamental maxim is applicable to all ſtates; but I ſhall conſider it chiefly in regard to Great Britain. In Great Britain the

rents of the lands may be ſtated at twenty-five millions, making a burden upon agriculture amounting to one third, and in ſome caſes to near one half of all that the iſland produces, which, as has been ſhewn, is our only revenue.

The cultivation of the ground is abſolutely neceſſary for the ſubſiſtence of man, but the payment of a rent is not abſolutely neceſſary for the cultivation of the ground. The farmer could cultivate it as well without paying a tax of fifty per cent, or thirty per cent for leave to cultivate it; and we have the experience before our eyes, that young ſtates thrive exceedingly, by being exempt from that unneceſſary tax. What has drawn ſo many ſettlers from Europe over to the late Britiſh Colonies in America, but the happy circumſtance of having lands without paying any rent, and formerly with the impolitic indulgence of paying hardly any public burdens. The circumſtance of paying no rent has been the attracting loadſtone to thouſands and ten thouſands to the American ſhores. Now can it be ſaid that the lands of America yield the leſs, becauſe the cultivators of them are alſo the poſſeſſors? Certainly not. On the contrary, the cultivators of the lands in America being at the ſame time the poſſeſſors of thoſe lands, are thereby exempted from a tax of 33 per cent, which the cultivators in Great Britain and Ireland are ſubject to, which circumſtance has been the very animating ſoul of the agriculture of the Americans, enabling them, in the commerce of grain, to underſel their mother country in foreign markets. Nay, it has

even

even ſerved them as a bounty of thirty-three per cent, to pour their corn in upon us, which was the ſame thing in point of policy on our ſide, as if a duty of thirty-three per cent had been impoſed upon Newcaſtle coals, and American coals had been admitted duty free.

If the practical example of the late Britiſh American Colonies proves to a demonſtration, that ſtates may not only exiſt, but flouriſh with the greateſt proſperity, without paying any rents for the lands that yield them their ſubſiſtence, the plain concluſion is, that land rents abſtractedly conſidered are unneceſſary burdens, and that land renters in that ſenſe are not an eſſential claſs in ſociety.

How then will a wiſe government, acting in conformity to the principles of nature, render the receivers of land rents an eſſential claſs in ſociety? The political Economiſt anſwers by aſſigning them an appropriate occupation; for it is contrary to all reaſon, and to all policy, to allow mere idlers in a ſtate, or to ſuffer thoſe who receive one third, or even but one fourth of the whole income of the kingdom, to do nothing for it in return. We are by the law of our nature condemned to earn our bread by the ſweat of our brow; but no law can juſtly exiſt, by which one man ſhall earn his bread by the ſweat of another man's brow, without rendering for it ſome equivalent.

The ſum of twenty-five millions ſterling, making between one third, and one fourth of the whole income of Great Britain, being paid by the cultivators to the proprietors of land, and being, as appears, an

actual burden upon the community, reaſon and ſound policy point it out as the natural fund for the defence of the community. When thus applied by the legiſlature, the poſſeſſors of thoſe rents inſtantly become not only an eſſential claſs in ſociety; but an honourable claſs likewiſe; for honour will ever be freely allowed to thoſe, whoſe profeſſion it is to be ready to riſk their lives in the defence of the community.

A caſe of danger to this kingdom, can hardly be ſuppoſed, that would require the military exertions of every fourth perſon in it, that is, that would abſorb the fourth part of its yearly income, or in other words, the whole of the land rents. A part of thoſe rents therefore may, without the riſk of any deficiency in point of defence, be appropriated to the annual maintenance of the fourth eſſential claſs in ſociety, namely, the eſſential and honourable claſs of inſtructors.

A full fourth, or, perhaps, near a third of the annual national income being thus applied, or applicable to the ſupport of the defenders and inſtructors, the people ought to be exempted from every ſpecies of taxation for the purpoſes of defence and inſtruction, that is, government ought to draw the whole of the national ſupplies in all caſes, from the rents of lands, as thoſe rents afford an ample fund for every ſuppoſed caſe of emergency.

Such is the natural conſequence of the principles of the political Economiſts, in reſpect to countries where the cultivators pay rents for the lands they cultivate; and in thoſe countries where the cultiva-

tors pay no rents for the lands they occupy, but are the maſters of their own ſurpluſes, the defence of their lands, in caſe of an attack from an enemy, muſt come out of thoſe ſurpluſes, or what is worſe, muſt come out of the capital poſſeſſion itſelf, upon the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread.

Thoſe whoſe minds have been preoccupied with the expediency and rectitude of the preſent moſt chaotic ſyſtem of taxation, and with the notion of the vaſt income ariſing to the ſtate from manufactures, have expreſſed great ſurprize and aſtoniſhment at the concluſion of the Economiſts, that the public ſupplies ought to be drawn wholly and directly from the rents of lands, or from the ſurplus produce of lands, that is, that there ſhould be no tax but a land tax. To the ſuperficial it has been matter of drollery; to the ſerious a ſtumbling block; and to the half-knowing an inexplicable riddle. In France, Germany, and Holland, it has had a great variety of oppoſers, as well as of approvers. The witty Voltaire attacked it in one of his moſt flimſy productions, L'homme a Quarante Ecus. The ſerious Necker expreſſes his doubts of it; and argues upon its impracticability; but his arguments are ſuch as moſt clearly prove, that the ſubject had not been juſtly conceived by him.

In Britain, Dr. Adam Smith views it aſkance, and cautiouſly ſhoves off the diſcuſſion of its merits, in the following evaſive words. 'Without entering, 'he ſays, into the diſagreeable diſcuſſion of the 'metaphyſical arguments, by which the Economiſts

'support their very ingenious theory, it will suf-
'ficiently appear from the following review what
'are the taxes that fall finally on the rent of land,
'and what are those that fall finally upon some
'other fund.' The perusal and reperusal of that very long and desultory review, to which he refers, has not to me discovered that difference of funds, from whence taxes originate, which he was to make so evident. The Economists found their system of policy and finance upon the three principles of *number*, *weight*, and *measure*; and if we are to reckon with Dr. Smith, *number*, *weight*, and *measure*, to be metaphysics, I should be glad to know what we are to consider as physics.

Though Dr. Smith thus glides over in a most cursorily manner, a subject of enquiry of the greatest importance to the Wealth of Nations; yet another British political writer, Mr. Arthur Young, thinks it deserving of a very particular discussion. Mr. Young declares himself a warm antagonist to the idea of the Economists, of drawing the whole of the public supplies from the rents of lands, or from the surplus produce of land, and endeavours to combat it by fair reasoning; but reasoning that is not substantial. Great Britain and Ireland are much indebted to him, for the persevering and patriotic zeal with which he has illustrated and enforced many truths, important to their prosperity. He every where appears to me a candid searcher after truth, disclaiming any hypothesis, though inadvertently adopted by himself, that has not truth for its basis. Therefore in giving a full refutation to his

very

very erroneous doctrines on this point, and others connected with it, and dependent upon it, I doubt not but he will think me entitled to his warmeſt thanks. My appeal ſhall be from Mr. Young ill informed, to Mr. Young better informed, and I flatter myſelf that I ſhall have him among the firſt and moſt zealous of my proſelytes.

Having in the preceding pages explained the fundamental principle of the Economiſts, namely, that a ſtate poſſeſſing a large territory has no other revenue than that ariſing from the produce of its lands, (excluſive of ſome ſmall income from foreign commerce) and as one third of that produce is in Great Britain given by thoſe who raiſe it, to a claſs of men, who if they were not to defend the ſtate, would in a political ſenſe have nothing to do, the defence of the ſtate therefore naturally and politically devolves upon that claſs of men, as every other claſs of men in a ſtate has its reſpective employment. From the fundamental principle above mentioned and above explained, it follows, that ſince there ought to be no other tax for the defence of the ſtate than a land tax, that tax ought to be moſt carefully collected, in a juſt proportion according to the exigencies of the ſtate, and that it is highly criminal in any receiver of land rents, to withhold from Government his due proportion of thoſe rents.

A crowd of new ideas, in regard to finance, will immediately ſucceed in the minds of thoſe who are fully convinced of the truth of the preceding principle, and its corollary; and their eyes will be opened to the inſignificance of almoſt all that Hume,

Monteſquieu, Neckar, Dr. Smith, and many others have ſaid upon the ſubject. The wild deviation from the true principle of taxation, which is now, and for near two hundred years has been, the practice of every European ſtate, has ſerved as an unſurmountable barrier to the acumen and ſpirit of enquiry of thoſe writers. They have ſhewn themſelves as little acquainted with the nature of public ſupply and national defence, as we were with New Holland before the diſcoveries of Captain Cook. Among the few nothings mentioned by Monteſquieu on the ſubject of taxation, he moſt decidedly, but abſurdly ſays, the *natural* tax of moderate governments is the duty laid on merchandize, which is really paid by the conſumer. Wonderful! we have not however one word from him, why ſuch a tax is more natural than a tax upon dogs, or upon hackney coaches. The complaints of the exceſs of taxes in France, had made an impreſſion upon him; and he makes the following remark upon that ſubject in general, which greatly ſupports the ſyſtem of the Economiſts, and might have opened to him the right tract, if his mind had not been completely hood-winked as to that point. 'It was the exceſs 'of taxes, he ſays, that occaſioned the prodigious 'facility, with which the Mahomedans carried on 'their conqueſts. Inſtead of a continual ſeries of 'extortions deviſed by the ſubtle avarice of the 'Greek Emperors, the people were ſubjected to a '*ſingle tribute*, which was paid and collected with 'eaſe. Thus they were far happier in obeying a 'barbarous nation, than a corrupt government, in

'which

'which they ſuffered every inconvenience of loſt 'liberty, with all the horrors of preſent ſlavery.' This *ſingle tribute*, paid with eaſe by the Greeks to the conquering Turks, was probably the produce of the ſoil at prime coſt, that is, unenhanced by nominal money, by exciſes, &c. The plain underſtandings of the Turks pointed out to them that the produce of the ſoil was the natural ſource of income, and that it was true policy to apply to that ſource directly, and to uſe every means to make it more abundant. And that ſyſtem they ſeem, through ſucceeding ages, to have perſevered in; for the eleganr Buſbequius, the Imperial ambaſſador, in his letters from Turkey, written near two hundred years ago, mentions with admiration the great fertility and well-cultivated fields of Aſia Minor; and we have it alſo upon good authority, that not half a century ago the buſhel of wheat was ſold at Smyrna for leſs than ſeventeen-pence*.

Mr. Young, in his treatiſe entitled *Political Arithmetic*, oppoſes with much zeal the idea of a ſingle tribute, or, in other words, a land-tax, adequate to the defence of the ſtate in every emergency; but his arguments, when examined upon the principles of the Economiſts, will be found to be mere deluſions, though of a very dangerous tendency to the public welfare, while they remain unrefuted. It would be a very tedious buſineſs to expoſe all the errors in that performance, which are thick ſcattered in the midſt of many uſeful truths;

* Vide Tracts on the Corn Trade, p. 33.

and

and it would likewiſe be an unneceſſary taſk, as the refutation of the eſſential errors will lead to the detection of the others, and take from the whole the power of further miſleading.

It is an idea of Mr. Young, and of many others beſides him, that near one-half of the income of the nation ariſes from manufactures; and upon this idea he ſays, page 239, 'The income of our ſoil 'is very conſiderable, but does not make much 'above half the total income of the ſtate. The 'profits and labour in commerce, manufactures, and 'arts, are of a vaſt amount, conſequently to ex-'empt them all from taxation, and throw the 'whole burden on land, would be unequal and op-'preſſive in the higheſt degree.' This reaſoning would be juſt, were any revenue in reality to ariſe to the ſtate from manufactures made and ſold at home; but as I have above ſhewn in my remarks on Dr. Smith's fifth obſervation, that manufactures, though greatly beneficial to the community, really produce no revenue, that is, no actual augmentation or renovation of wealth, it conſequently follows, that no public ſupply can be drawn from them. There is not, therefore, the ſmalleſt neceſſity for further enlarging on this point, as what is before ſaid is a ſufficient explanation of it.

I ſhall proceed to conſider another fundamental error of Mr. Young, which pervades the whole of his performance. He has, like Dr. Adam Smith, never once conſidered the political nature of rent paid by a cultivator for leave to cultivate the ground.

ground. With him the rent of land is ſomething ſacred, indefeaſibly appropriated to the landlords, who have a right to increaſe it as much as poſſible, and to diſpoſe of it as they pleaſe. It is no burden upon the cultivators, that is, upon the community at large; for the cultivators, he ſays, in this country, feel very little the burden of taxation, which he attempts to prove by ſeveral curſory obſervations on the exciſes, cuſtoms, window-lights, poor rates, and other taxes, totally overlooking the payment of rent, that is, the payment of ſix ſhillings and eight pence in the pound, or even but five ſhillings in the pound, by the farmer, of all his earnings and profits. Sentiments ſomewhat ſimilar I remember to have read ſeveral years ago, apologiſing for the conduct of ſome land owners in the Highlands of Scotland, who ſtating that they had a right to do as they pleaſed with their own, upon that principle raiſed their rents exorbitantly, and thereby compelled their tenants to emigrate to America. The tenants practically replied to this falſe principle of their unfeeling landlords, by ſhewing them that they had a right to inhabit where they pleaſed. Now, according to the principle of the Economiſts, every man in a ſtate ought to have ſome occupation; and the rents of lands being a ſurplus income falling into the lap of the land owners, without their contributing to the production of that ſurplus, and tending to enhance the price of things one-third or one-fourth, reaſon requires that the land owners ſhould do ſomething for the community in return for the privilege of having this ſurplus ſecured

to

to them by the community. The words of Cicero to this purpoſe are very appoſite, ‘ Major hereditas ‘ venit unicuique veſtrum in iiſdem bonis a jure & ‘ a legibus, quam ab iis, a quibus illa ipſa bona ‘ relicta ſunt ;’ that is, You are not ſo much indebted to your rich father or rich grand-father for the great landed income you poſſeſs, as to the laws and government which protect you in the poſſeſſion of that income. Government having thus a natural claim upon thoſe whom it protects in the enjoyment of great incomes, to the production of which they contribute no labour of their own, has a right to aſk for a part of this ſurplus for the defence of the ſtate, as being the only diſpoſable revenue in the ſtate. For the cultivator, it is evident, cannot both fight and at the ſame time provide ſubſiſtence for the community; the fiſherman when fiſhing cannot be fighting; the manufacturer, if any thing be taken from his wages, muſt either ſtarve or raiſe his wages, which laſt tends to load commodities with an artificial value. The ſtate, however, muſt be defended; and thus, by placing the defence upon the ſurplus revenue, every landlord in the kingdom becomes politically as much a tenant to the ſtate, as any of his farmers is a tenant to him.

Another very capital error which Mr. Young endeavours to eſtabliſh is, that an equal land tax raiſed in proportion to the value of the rents, would be a moſt pernicious ſyſtem. His ſhort argument in ſupport of this error is, that the improver would thereby be taxed according to his improvements. Now if we examine this herculean

argu-

argument, printed by him in capital letters, we ſhall find that it is wholly unſubſtantial, and that Mr. Young himſelf will aſſiſt us in refuting his own falſe doctrine. In the firſt place, his concluſion does not follow from his premiſes; for a real four ſhillings in the pound, though not now paid, may be demanded from lands that have received no improvement for theſe hundred years. But waving this overſight, the Economiſt affirms, that the argument of Mr. Young againſt a valuation of the land tax according to the real amount of the rents, is the ſtrongeſt argument in favour of ſuch a valuation. When does a creditor moſt naturally look for the payment of a debt, but when his debtor is in caſh? When ought government ſo properly to aſk more of a landlord, as when that landlord aſks more of his tenant? Does not a landlord who raiſes his rent upon a new leaſe, tax the improver according to his improvement? Does he not, in effect, argue to the following purpoſe with his farmer—Your farm twenty years ago was worth only 50l. a year, but in conſequence of your good management it is now worth 70l. a year; therefore I ſhall require that rent from you during the preſent leaſe. Every one will readily acknowledge that within this half-century the rents of lands are riſen very conſiderably over the whole iſland. What can this riſe be owing to but to real improvement, or the preſumption of future improvement. If upon the preſumption of future improvement, which I am afraid is too often the caſe, then the improver is not taxed in proportion to the improvement he

has

has made; which is just and equitable, because the property is really become more valuable; but according to an improvement *in futuro*, which may never take place at all, consequently he may be forced to pay a new taxation without any new fund to support that taxation. But hear what may be concluded from Mr. Young himself. From his information, the rents in Norfolk are now four times higher than they were forty years ago, and the tenants in that county are in a very thriving state. It may be presumed, that this fourfold rise of rent in Norfolk is founded upon improvement of some kind or other; for to found it upon no improvement would not be just and equitable. If, then, improvement has enabled the land owners in Norfolk to quadruple their rents within the space of forty years, and at the same time to enrich their tenants, it plainly follows, that to tax the improver in proportion to his improvements, has not been a pernicious system in the county of Norfolk, and therefore would not be a pernicious system if extended to the whole kingdom. Government, it must ever be kept in mind, in requiring a land tax in proportion to the real value of the rents, is only the secondary taxer; for the land owner precedes in raising his rent according to the improvements made by his tenant; if, therefore, the land owner, who is the primary taxer, has acted equitably and judiciously in demanding a higher rent, in consequence of a real improvement of the soil, government cannot act wrong in demanding the usual proportion upon that new rent.—That is to say, *An equal land*

land tax, raiſed in proportion to the real value of the rents, is a juſt and truly politic ſyſtem.

A fourth erroneous doctrine, fondly embraced by Mr. Young, is the importance of high price to the proſperity of agriculture, and even to the proſperity of the nation. But this doctrine, inculcated by him in a variety of places, he leaves unſupported by any ſolid argument. It is, indeed, an excellent doctrine for thoſe who could poſſeſs an excluſive monopoly of ſelling, and were never to be buyers; but as no claſs of men in a community, nor indeed any nation upon earth, can poſſeſs ſuch a monopoly; and as all buyers run naturally to the cheap market, it is the heighth of political imprudence in a nation wiſhing to extend its foreign commerce, to give an artificial riſe to prices by a needleſs augmentation of their pecuniary value. Will a buſhel of wheat feed more people when ſold for ten ſhillings than when ſold for half-a-crown? Will a pound of gunpowder ſend a ball farther if ſold for five ſhillings inſtead of one ſhilling? Similar queſtions may be extended to the whole circle of commerce, both internal and external, which would plainly prove that high price is not favourable to the extenſion either of manufacture or of agriculture.

Already it is affirmed that high price has deprived us of one branch of manufacture, the printing of Engliſh books for foreign ſale, ſuch books being now printed in France for the American market; and if high price be in like manner annexed to the productions of the plough, we ſhall thereby aſſur-

edly be deprived of the profitable trade of the exportation of corn.

Were we to have no connection at all with foreign nations, high price or low price in all our internal dealings, ſuppoſing thoſe prices fixed and ſtable, would not affect our national proſperity, as the price of the ſubſiſtence of the labourer would ſtill regulate all other prices. In the one caſe, high price would permanently meet high price, as in the other, low price would permanently meet low price. But while that claſs in ſociety, from whom the revenue originates, are from year to year puſhing the nominal value of that revenue higher and higher, the balance between ſellers and buyers is kept in perpetual uncertainty, and the peaceful order of ſociety is thereby greatly diſturbed. Thoſe whoſe yearly ſalaries were adequate to their yearly wants, find that they have only a full ſupply for nine months; and thoſe whoſe weekly wages were adequate to ſeven days ſupply, find that they have only a full ſubſiſtence for four days, and to make them hold out, they muſt go upon ſhort allowance during the whole week. As this augmentation of the nominal value of the produce of land conſequently augments the nominal value of every thing elſe, the reſult is, that the landed gentleman is not thereby enriched, nor are ſellers in general enriched by it, ſince what they gain as ſellers, they preciſely expend in quality of buyers. Thus George Faulkener having occaſion to expend but little, probably gained as much by his Dublin Journal when ſold

for

for a farthing, as many of thoſe who in London now ſell their newſpaper for eighteen farthings; and he furniſhed for his farthing as many advertiſements and as much news as they do for their eighteen farthings.

Another inſtance of the unavailing power of high price to make rich, may be gathered from what was lately declared in the Houſe of Commons by Mr. Whitbread. Mr. Young, in his Political Arithmetic, gave it as a ſign of national proſperity, that the land rents of Norfolk had within forty years encreaſed four-fold, not diſtinguiſhing what was nominal and what was real in that increaſe, and now by Mr. Whitbread we are informed, that the Norfolk Barley, though not of a very good kind, is ſo extravagantly dear, that brewers can hardly afford to purchaſe it; that barley in general is ſo high priced, that they have been obliged to brew porter of an inferior quality, and are doubtful whether they ſhall be able to continue the trade.

The trade, however, might be continued without loſs to the brewer, were the price of porter and other malt liquor to be doubled, were ſalaries and wages to be doubled, and the price of home manufactures to be doubled. But in what reſpect would the nation be a gainer by theſe new nominal values, taking into view either its connection with foreign ſtates, or conſidering it independantly of any relation to thoſe ſtates. In the former caſe it would infallibly oblige our foreign cuſtomers to leave off trading with us; and in the latter, ſuppoſing us not to be in need of foreign trade, it would only

make us pay with ſhillings what we now pay with ſixpences.

There are few people, I believe, that would not confeſs that this duplication of prices, inſtead of being beneficial to the nation, would not be extremely prejudicial to it. Nevertheleſs, from the prevalence of a falſe principle in regard to taxation and the national utility of high price, we are moſt improvidently haſtening towards it, by raiſing year after year, without neceſſity, the prices of the neceſſaries of life, and, as a corrective to that malady, forming plans for raiſing proportionally the rate of wages and the hire of labourers. True policy would rather recommend to keep wages and the hire of labourers ſteadily at their preſent rate, or at the rates at which they were forty years ago, and at the ſame time to uſe ſuch means as to bring the neceſſary articles of living to correſpond to thoſe rates. If ſuch had been our policy, national abundance with us would have been greater and more general, and volumes of laborious and patriotic diſquiſitions about meliorating the preſent ſtate of labourers would have been rendered altogether unneceſſary.

In a well-governed ſtate, the price of labour may remain nearly unalterable for many centuries; and in the Eaſt Indies, before European modes of taxation were there introduced, the prices of things, it may be preſumed, had remained nearly ſtationary for 2000 years. What more can the ſucceſſive generations of men require, during their temporary life here, than to have fulneſs of bread; and, ſuppoſing

poſing the population of one age equal to that of another, the fertility and cultivation of the ground the ſame, and the medium of circulation not augmented or diminiſhed, each ſucceeding race of men may have that fulneſs of bread in the ſame degree as the preceding, and at the ſame price.

Were the permanent augmentation of the quantity of gold and ſilver to be alleged as a reaſon for the riſe in the prices of things, it will on that ground perhaps be found, that prices ought to be very little higher now than they were an hundred years ago; for ſuppoſing the quantity of ſpecie to be doubled in this iſland ſince the revolution, which may juſtly be doubted, that ought not to double the prices; for if population in that time be increaſed, ſuppoſe in the proportion of two to three, fifteen millions of coin would not now be a greater abundance of money than ten millions were at the revolution; conſequently, if the quantity of circulating money was at the revolution ten millions, the nation ought now to poſſeſs conſiderably more than thirty millions in ſpecie, to occaſion the prices of things to be twice as high as they were then; for, ſince the revolution, the great improvements in the cultivation of the lands of the kingdom would otherwiſe have lowered prices, inſtead of raiſing them.

Though the real augmentation of the quantity of gold and ſilver affords no ground for the riſe of prices, yet the moſt extravagant augmentation of the expletive medium of circulation called paper-money (often the repreſentative of nothing) has

contributed to overſpread the land with high price in every direction, all ranks being now reciprocally complainers or complained of. As the great augmentation of this imaginary wealth has been a principal cauſe of introducing this epidemical malady into the kingdom, the true remedy for the illneſs will be found in removing that cauſe of it; namely, in ſuppreſſing this inefficient wealth, and ſtudying without delay to augment the ſubſtantial wealth of the country by means of the plough. To the diſgrace of our policy, it may lately have been ſaid of us, Nummis Chartaceis locuples eget panis Britannorum gens; Britons, though wanting bread, abound in paper riches. The legiſlature that will ſedulouſly endeavour to increaſe the phyſical wealth of the country, by encouraging the cultivation of its lands, may, without heſitation, ſay to every one of the coiners of imaginary money, Tolle tuas precor imagines et cum tota farragine migra; take yourſelf and your imaginary riches out of the country: it is ſubſtantial riches that are wanted; and this our lands will furniſh us abundantly and cheaply, if you will but withdraw your interference. So far, however, from withdrawing their interference, they have lately moſt inſidiouſly preached up the neceſſity of augmenting the preſent medium of circulation, and a newly-eſtabliſhed bank in Norfolk-ſtreet upon that principle offers its ſervices to the public. If a ſpirit of re-action do not occupy the country gentlemen, there is no knowing how far the miſchief may lead. They, however, have a good precedent and example in the gentle-

men

men of Brecknockſhire; who, four or five years ago, in a county meeting, came to the reſolution of not accepting in payments any notes of country banks. This example ought to be followed by every land owner in Great Britain; and the moment that peace returns, the land proprietors throughout the kingdom ought to declare to their tenants, that, except when the rent is to be paid in kind, they will not receive in payment of it any thing but gold and ſilver.

But it is not only neceſſary to aboliſh, or nearly to aboliſh *, this artificial wealth, which, by heightening all prices, tends actually to impoveriſh the ſtate, and conſequently to weaken government, it is alſo neceſſary, without delay, to augment the ſubſtantial wealth of the nation, and thereby to bring the prices of neceſſaries to correſpond to the exiſting rate of wages. At preſent, and for many years back, the attention to augment the nominal wealth of the nation, ſeems to have greatly exceeded the attention to augment the ſubſtantial and phyſical wealth of the nation. A little, at a high price, has moſt impolitically been preferred to much at a low price. Now the very object of true policy is, to have the ſubſtantial and phyſical wealth permanently abundant, becauſe, in proportion as that wealth is abundant or ſcanty, ſo will be the natural ſtrength or weakneſs of a ſtate.

The abundance of phyſical wealth, and the rate

* I ſay nearly to aboliſh; for there is, I think, a poſſibility of inſtituting country banks ſo as not to be prejudicial to the nation.

or market value of that wealth, ought ever to be conſidered diſtinctly. If the land proprietor, from whom this wealth originates, and the ſtateſman will conſider theſe two things ſeparately, they will both readily acknowledge that the former ought to be the firſt object of purſuit, as much as abundance of water ought to be a firſt object of purſuit to the proprietor of a water-mill. This phyſical wealth, whatever be its rate, is the power that regulates the whole of the induſtry of ſociety. It cannot effect more by being rated high, nor will it effect leſs by being rated low; but if its quantity be increaſed, the power thence ariſing will be proportionally increaſed.

A garriſon, ſupplied with 20,000 ſacks of flour, may be expected to hold out a ſiege twice as long as if it were ſupplied with only 10,000 ſacks of flour; but it would be juſtly deemed a moſt abſurd and extravagant idea to think of ſtrengthening the garriſon, not by ſupplying it with 20,000 ſacks of flour, but by doubling the price of the 10,000 ſacks. If it be wiſe and prudent to ſtrengthen a garriſon, not by increaſing the price of the ſupply which it poſſeſſes, but by increaſing the quantity of that ſupply, it will be no leſs wiſe and prudent to ſtrengthen a nation in the ſame manner; that is, not by increaſing the price of the ſubſtantial wealth, which it produces, but by increaſing the quantity of that wealth*.

There

* Preſuming that it will not be unacceptable to my learned readers, I ſhall here remark, that Longinus, not being an Econo-

There is not, at preſent, a complaint more general among all claſſes of men than that there is hardly any living, becauſe all things are become ſo extravagantly dear. There is, however, a poſſibility that all things might become extremely plentiful, and conſequently extremely cheap, and the ſyſtem of the Economiſts leads to that. A common complaint, even among the rich, is, that the keeping of a horſe is at preſent extremely expenſive, oats and fodder are become ſo immoderately dear. Now the fact is, that the keep of a horſe is in reality not dearer at preſent than it was 500 years ago; nay, perhaps is even cheaper; for 500 years ago it might have required the produce of three acres, but, from the improvements in agriculture, the produce of two acres may perhaps now ſuffice. In like manner, the maintenance of a regiment of ſoldiers is probably not more in reality

Economiſt, has, in ſect. 29 of his Eſſay on the Sublime, miſunderſtood Plato, and cenſured him improperly. After having praiſed the rhetorical figure of circumlocution, and obſerved that in the uſe of it Plato was δεινος, or very eminent, he ſays he was accuſed by ſome of uſing it ſometimes very improperly, as in the following expreſſion, In a ſtate, no gold wealth or ſilver wealth ought to be admitted. The mockers, who thought the word wealth might have ſufficed, alleged, that he might juſt as well, in prohibiting cattle to be purchaſed, have ſaid, *No ſheep wealth*, and *no oxen wealth*. Plato's circumlocution, however, is here moſt appoſite and emphatic. He placed the riches of a ſtate in ſomething elſe than gold and ſilver; and though he baniſhed them from his common-wealth, he by no means excluded the phyſical wealth flowing from agriculture; and therefore he particularly diſtinguiſhes the kind of wealth which he would have to be excluded.

now

now than it was 150 years ago, but the parliamentary eſtimates, and exceedings of eſtimates, prove that the pecuniary expence of preſent days is far beyond what it was 150 years ago; that government accompliſhes not ſo much with 20 millions as it formerly did with 5 millions, and that it is now actually experiencing the impotence of pecuniary wealth.

Other political writers, beſides Mr. Young, have been deluded by the notion of the great importance of high price. The following falſe computation of Davenant has been repeated, with eulogiums, by ſubſequent writers. 'In the year 1600,' ſays Davenant, 'the whole rental of England did not exceed '6 millions, and the price of land was 12 years purchaſe; in 1688 the rental was 14 millions, and the 'price of land 18 years purchaſe, ſo that within 'this period, the land roſe from 72, to 252 'millions.' A modern author, by the ſame way of computing, reckoned the value of the lands of England a few years ago at 700 millions, that is, according to him, the lands of England are near ten times as valuable now as they were in the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign. This the Economiſt affirms to be a moſt groſs miſcalculation, ſimilar to that of doubling the price of the ſupply of a garriſon, inſtead of doubling the ſupply; for, in the time of Elizabeth, England fed and clothed 4 millions of people; and at the preſent day can hardly feed and clothe 8 millions of people; conſequently the real riſe of value of its lands is barely double. But, if inſtead of multiplying money, and thereby needleſsly raiſing prices, we had been ſtudious for theſe 200 years paſt to have

multiplied ſubſtantial and phyſical wealth by an unremitting encouragement of agriculture, the lands of England at this moment might perhaps have been near four times as valuable as in the time of Elizabeth, that is, they might now be feeding and clothing 15 or 16 millions of inhabitants.

Mr. Young's ill-grounded fondneſs for high price leads him to undervalue or decry low price or cheapneſs, without, however, explaining by any kind of illuſtration, the prejudice that low price would bring upon a community. He makes aſſertion ſupply the place of argument, and ſays, p. 82, 'Cheapneſs of 'proviſions is ſuch an encourager of idleneſs, that 'no manufactures can ſtand under it.' Now, ſo far from this aſſertion being conſiſtent with fact, cheapneſs of proviſions is the very thing that enterpriſing maſter manufacturers above all things wiſh for. It is the load-ſtone that draws manufactures to itſelf. It has drawn the woollen manufactures even away from the woollen counties into the North; it has removed the gauze manufacture from London to Paiſley; and the blanket manufacture from London to Dundee. What cheapneſs of proviſions is in ſome places, cheapneſs of coals is to Briſtol, Newcaſtle, Birmingham, and Carron. Were coals to be as dear in thoſe places, as in ſome parts of the kingdom, can it be doubted but their glaſs works and iron works would quickly decline. Were a manufacturer of Birmingham to be aſked whether he would wiſh coals and proviſions to be dear there, he would probably anſwer by the following queſtion: Sir, would you wiſh to ruin our town?

The

The ſame that cheapneſs or low price effects within the iſland, it effects throughout the whole commercial world. What turned the channel of the ſugar trade from the Britiſh to the French Coloniſts, but becauſe theſe laſt ſold for 50 livres, what the Britiſh Coloniſts aſked 50 ſhillings for. What elſe but cheapneſs brings rice and ſugar to Britain from the Eaſt Indies, by a voyage of near 10,000 miles? What has brought American wheat, produced 300 miles from the ſea, to Europe, but its cheapneſs? What but cheapneſs brings Ruſſian iron to Britain, loaded with an inland carriage of 1000 miles? With theſe, and twenty other examples of the ſame kind before our eyes, ſhall we expect to invite foreign cuſtomers by high prices? We wiſh greatly to extend our foreign commerce, and at the ſame time we have many commercial rivals. Now internal high price has actually the effect of a bounty beſtowed by us on thoſe foreign rivals againſt ourſelves. By our high prices we thus in effect ſay to the Swedes, We ſhall promote the ſale of your herrings in foreign markets, in preference to our own, by keeping our own herrings 3 ſhillings a barrel dearer than yours.

In all things, a medium is beſt; therefore I doubt not but the following obſervation, made 100 years ago by the judicious Mr. Cary, of Briſtol, will meet with approbation. 'The price of wheat,' he ſays, 'ariſes from the price of land; and the price of 'labour from the price of proviſions; you cannot 'fall wages unleſs you fall product; but no good 'in running it down too low.' Suppoſing that at preſent we have raiſed a barrier againſt many foreign cuſtomers,

cuſtomers, by our high prices, which they find 5 or 6 per cent higher than thoſe of our commercial rivals, it would be no detriment to the nation to remove that obſtacle, not only by lowering our prices that 5 or 6 per cent, which would bring them to a par with thoſe of our commercial rivals, but to lower them likewiſe 5 or 6 per cent even below that par. This would ſtill be conſiſtent with Mr. Cary's rule, and would give to foreigners a moſt decided preference to the Britiſh market. Mr. Young ſees nothing but national perdition in lowering of prices; but from his own reaſoning on the ſubject of the price of wheat it may be concluded, that previous to the late ſcarcity, that price was in effect one third lower than in the end of the laſt century. And ſince the invention of ſpinning mills, the price of cotton goods is fallen 50 per cent. As neither of theſe circumſtances has brought any inconvenience upon the public, it may be preſumed that the extenſion of the ſame ſyſtem to other articles would not be accompanied with any detriment to the community. The encouragement of agriculture, and the inducement to reproduction, is not high price, but great conſumption, which ariſes from general induſtry; for with high price, there may be little conſumption and great want.

Thoſe who meaſure the value of things by high price, are but too much inclined to run in ſearch of that high price, in preference to the promoting of phyſical abundance, which is the very prop of ſociety. Becauſe in Covent-Garden-market green figs are about 40 times dearer than they are at Naples,

ples, would it be juſt from thence to conclude, that London is 40 times richer in that article than Naples. Thoſe who make high price the ſtandard of national opulence, naturally drop into ſuch an erroneous concluſion, and, by their way of reckoning, an acre of garden-ground in the north parts of Scotland is twice as valuable as in the neighbourhood of London; for by the ſtatiſtical ſtate of Scotland, it appears, that in the north ſome garden-ground is rented at the rate of 8l. per acre. This rent, however, is more likely to be the ſtandard of the oppreſſion of that part of the country, than of its proſperity; for it may well be preſumed that an acre of garden-ground in the vicinity of London, rented at no more than 4l. would yield a greater quantity of produce than could be procured from an acre of garden-ground in the north. A great part of the enormity of this oppreſſive rent would be done away, if, according to the natural ſyſtem of taxation for government ſupply, one fifth, or one ſixth of it, were appropriated to the defence of the ſtate, as thoſe that are now heavily taxed by that high rent, would then be relieved from other taxes.

I ſhall conclude this point, at preſent, with the following remark. Mr. Young ſays, p. 245, That high price enables landlords to raiſe their rents, and thereby to reimburſe themſelves for their taxes. But it may be aſked of Mr. Young, why ſhould landlords be reimburſed their taxes, any more than their tenants are reimburſed the 33 per cent, or the 25 per cent, which they pay to them for leave to cultivate the ground. The indemnification of every man

for

for the taxes paid by him, is internal peace and external defence. Can any man reaſonably expect to enjoy thoſe two great bleſſings for nothing?

Another of Mr. Young's erroneous doctrines, or rather ignorant poſitions, which I ſhall now proceed to examine, is the following; that taxes on conſumption ought to have the preference to other taxes, for this moſt ſuperficial reaſon (alleged alſo, as we have ſeen before, by Monteſquieu), 'That 'they are paid by the conſumers.' There he and Monteſquieu reſt, having ſatisfied themſelves, that they have explained the nature of taxes on conſumption. The conſumers pay them. Neither he nor Monteſquieu condeſcend to inform their readers what it is that enables the conſumer to be a conſumer, though upon that very point reſts the diſtinct explanation of the whole of the expenditure of the kingdom. What ſhould we think of a guide to the caſtle of truth, who ſhould ſay to the enquiring traveller, this road leads directly to it through that dark and pathleſs wood. When you enter the wood, you muſt find your way to the caſtle in the beſt manner you can. Exactly ſuch guides are Monteſquieu and Mr. Young. They ceaſe giving information preciſely where it is moſt wanted. Who doubts, that taxes upon conſumption are in the firſt inſtance paid by the conſumer; but does that lead to any final political reſult in regard to the real fund for ſuch taxes? Not in the ſmalleſt degree. When a ſchool-boy purchaſes a folding knife, or a cricket bat, he is certainly the conſumer in the firſt inſtance. The Economiſt, however, not only aſks who furniſhed him with money

ney to be a conſumer; but who furniſhed the money to the perſon who ſupplied the ſchool-boy, and who furniſhed the money to that third perſon, and who to the fourth, the fifth, the ſixth perſon, &c. and by ſuch a reiterated inveſtigation, he will in the end trace the money to the ſale of ſome of the agricultural produce of the earth. And he defies Mr. Young, or any other perſon, to draw the money diſburſed by the ſchool-boy from any other fund, beſides that fund (the mines of the precious metals alone excepted), a fund which was not in exiſtence laſt year, that will perhaps be wholly conſumed this year, but will be reproduced next year, by the fertility of the ſoil, in conjunction with the labours of the cultivator. In like manner, it will be found, that the money diſburſed by the blackſmith, the maſon, the carpenter, and every other artiſan, as conſumers, may be traced to the ſame fund; and if in conſequence of taxes on conſumption, that money is twice as much as it otherwiſe would have been, that twice as much will occaſion the original fund to be rated double in commercial value; but will not increaſe the fund.

Were a modern financier to ſay to a carpenter, your wages of two ſhillings a day allows you to be a conſumer; I mean, therefore, by laying taxes on conſumption, to draw four-pence or ſix-pence a day from you, the carpenter might very juſtly reply, You will in that be much deceived; for when I find articles of conſumption taxed, I and all my fellow workmen will inſiſt upon half-a-crown a day as wages; and that new demand will be moſt reaſonable, for when we had

had two ſhillings a day, we had not, at the end of the year, one ſhilling of ſurplus, neither ſhall we have more, out of our half crown. The whole body of artiſans throughout the kingdom is repreſented by that carpenter, as are all others who give their labour for wages; for thoſe wages in a populous country actually meaſure themſelves by the daily or annual ſubſiſtence of the receivers, without any regard to the pecuniary value of that ſubſiſtence.

Were Mr. Young upon his idea, that there is no need of enquiring what enables the conſumers to become conſumers, to propoſe to the French loyaliſts, now refugees in England, to become greater conſumers, in order that government might be more benefited by them, they might, perhaps, reply in the following manner. Alas, Sir, it is not in our power to be greater conſumers; the blood-thirſty tyrants at Paris have treated us as Hercules treated the giant Antæus; they have removed us from our Parent Earth; and inſtead of being conſumers, we are ready to periſh. Let us but touch again our Mother Earth, and we ſhall revive, and become conſumers. There is no other means but that.

In order to avoid needleſsly enlarging my preſent diſcourſe, I ſhall omit taking notice of ſeveral of Mr. Young's ſmaller errors, the mere offspring of his falſe principles in eſſential points, and I ſhall conclude my remarks upon his Political Arithmetic with expoſing the futility of what he deems the unſurmountable objection to the *ſingle tribute* or ſingle tax propoſed by the Eco-

nomiſts. Like Mr. Neckar, he falls into the blind miſtake of making the general amount of the preſent taxes the ſtandard or meaſure of the ſum total to be required by government, if all the taxes were to be conſolidated into a ſingle land tax. Becauſe the taxes at preſent raiſed by Government, added to the annual loans, required during a war, exceed the amount of the land rents of Great Britain, he concludes, the ſingle tribute propoſed by the Economiſts would abſorb the whole of thoſe rents, and not leave one farthing of income to the land proprietors, nay, would even occaſion an annual deficit to government. Mr. Necker is more moderate in his computation; and upon a compariſon of the income of the land rents of France with the amount of its taxes, concludes, that the ſingle tribute would run away with only 17 ſhillings in the pound of the rents. But neither of theſe authors advert to circumſtances which totally overturn their concluſions. The ſingle tribute of the Economiſts ariſing from the ſurplus produce of the ſoil has nothing at all to do with the amount of modern taxes, become cumberſome by artificial price, accumulated upon artificial price, in conſequence of a Public Debt of near 400 millions, which, according to the ſyſtem of the Economiſts, would not at this moment have had any exiſtence. The queſtion with Mr. Neckar and Mr. Young ought to have been, Will four ſhillings in the pound of the rents of land ſuffice for the defence of the ſtate in all preſumable emergencies; and for Great Britain, at leaſt, the following computation, I think, will ſhew, that the anſwer may

be in the affirmative, and will prove not only the great moderation, but the great efficacy of this tax. The rent of the land owners I ſhall ſtate at only 1-4th of the general produce; and four ſhillings in the pound of that rent demanded by Government, is one 1-5th of it. Now 1-5th of 1-4th is equal to one 1-20th; that is, a land tax of four ſhillings in the pound would be equivalent to one ſhilling in the pound of the whole national income. In Great Britain are reckoned 72 millions of acres, and upwards. Now, of thoſe 72 millions of acres, ſuppoſe 16 millions to be of little or no value, and that 16 millions more are required for horſes, this will leave 40 millions for the ſuſtenance of man. Of thoſe 40 millions of productive acres, one twentieth, or two millions of acres are demanded by government for defence. This government ſhare, therefore, allowing eight acres for the ſuſtenance of one man, would enable Great Britain to maintain 250,000 men. But it may be ſaid that a war eſtabliſhment would require more than 250,000 men. I allow it. But would not a peace eſtabliſhment require much fewer; therefore joining the two together, and taking the average, that average would be found not to exceed a land tax of four ſhillings in the pound; nay, would probably not exceed three ſhillings in the pound.

The following computation, I think, will prove, that if ſince the revolution a true aſſeſſment of the land tax had taken place, and a real four ſhillings in the pound had been raiſed on the rents of land in Great Britain, we ſhould, previous to the commencement of the preſent war, have been entirely free from

any national debt. From Sir John Sinclair's valuable History of the Publick Revenue, part 2d. page 63. it appears that the national debt, on the 31ſt of December, 1701, was 16,394,702 pounds, that is about eleven years after the ſyſtem of borrowing began. But ſuppoſing the land tax, from its firſt eſtabliſhment, to have been not a nominal but a real four ſhillings in the pound, and conſequently to have amounted to one million a year more than it actually produced, this new national debt would thereby have been diminiſhed eleven millions, and would have been, in December, 1701, only 5,394,702l. The war of the ſucceſſion, in Queen Anne's time, occaſioned a further augmentation of the publick debt, which is ſtated in the above mentioned hiſtory at 54,145,363l. on the 31ſt of December, 1714, but from this muſt be deducted, firſt, the preceding eleven millions, and ſecondly, thirteen millions more, which the land tax, at a real four ſhillings, would have produced from 1701 to 1714. Theſe deductions, then, would have left the publick debt, at Queen Anne's death, at no more than 30,145,363l. Soon after the death of King George I. that is, in 1727, the national debt, by the ſame hiſtorian, is ſtated at 52,092,235l. but from the preceding obſervations, from this ſum of 52,092,235l. the 24 millions before paid off are to be deducted, and likewiſe a million per annum, for 14 years, furniſhed by the land tax at a real four ſhillings in the pound, conſequently in December, 1727, the amount of the national debt would have been only 14,092,235l. Twelve years afterwards, when the Spaniſh war broke

out

out in 1739, the national debt is stated at 46,954,623l. but the reductions in the preceding periods would have taken from this debt 38 millions, and reduced it to 8,954,623l. while in the same period, the annual million arising from the land tax at a real four shillings would have given a supply of 12 millions, which would have extinguished the whole debt, and left above the sum of 3 millions as a surplus in the Exchequer. By the same computation, the national debt in December, 1790, which is stated at 247,833,250l. would have been really only 170,719,685l. Thus, it may be said, is far short of a complete extinction of the national debt in 1790. But the following considerations will serve to prove, that on this point the means would have been adequate to the end. Mr. Briscoe, who exactly 100 years ago published several judicious remarks upon the new funds, proves by arithmetical tables, that for the loans of 1,000,000l. in 1692, and 1,200,000l. in 1693, Government actually bound itself to pay back 32 millions. Now, if the land tax had produced one million more each of those years, those two loans would not have taken place, and 32 millions of the national debt would have been thus prevented. Again, I have taken the land tax at a real four shillings, as producing only one million more than it now produces; but for these last fifty years it might justly have been taken as producing annually two additional millions; consequently, these additional fifty millions, joined to the annual savings upon the interest operating at compound interest, which I have not reckoned upon, would have done

much more than liquidate the above 170,719,685l. of national debt.

Should the heavy expences of a war oblige government in future to have recourſe to a loan, that loan, like thoſe in King William's time, would be inconſiderable; and whatever debt was contracted during the war, it is plain from the preceding reaſoning ought in time of peace to be liquidated by the land tax, by keeping that tax at ſuch a rate above the peace eſtabliſhment, as might afford a conſiderable annual reimburſement, till the whole new debt were paid off. This the land owners would find the cheapeſt expedient for themſelves; for by avoiding the repetition of taxes on conſumption, they would avoid the artificial price, thereby added to commodities, a heavier burden upon them than a direct land tax.

Having thus eſtabliſhed, by reaſoning which appears to me concluſive, the fundamental principle, That the primary and eſſential ſource of the Wealth of a Nation is the produce of its ſoil procured by the labour of the huſbandman; and having alſo illuſtrated the conſequence ariſing from that principle, That the ſupply for the defence of the ſtate ought naturally to be drawn from the ſurplus of that produce, as being the only diſpoſeable revenue in the community, I ſhall now, for the further ſatisfaction of my readers, proceed to confirm what I have ſaid relative to the national ſupply by an appeal to facts.

The ſyſtem of the Economiſts, as appears from the preceding pages, tends to ſweep away the whole of the taxes enumerated in Kearſley's Tax Tables, to

aboliſh

aboliſh all Exciſes, all Stamps, in ſhort, to extinguiſh all taxes but the Land Tax and the Cuſtoms, nay, even if poſſible not to ſpare the Cuſtoms. To this, ſome who make modern uſages the meaſure of poſſibilities, will be apt to object as a new and unheard of theory, which no practice could ever realize. No; the Economiſt replies, ſo far from being a new theory, it is only a revival of the ſyſtem of ancient days, with all the improvements that modern times render that ſyſtem ſuſceptible of. The French writers who have treated of this ſubject, have not done juſtice to it, in conſidering it as the new diſcovery of modern times. It is no more a new diſcovery than the diſcovery of Copernicus, in regard to the planetary ſyſtem, which was known to the Pythagoreans two thouſand years before. The doctrine of the Economiſts may now have been explained more fully than heretofore; yet imperfectly as it might have been formerly underſtood, it was, nevertheleſs, the rule of practice not only of this nation, but of many other civilized nations of Europe and Aſia.

The ſyſtem of the Economiſts, I have ſaid, leads to ſweep away the whole of the taxes enumerated in Kearſley's Tax Tables, and to aboliſh the Exciſes and Stamps. Now, I would aſk my readers, if any of thoſe taxes were known to Queen Elizabeth. Did either the Exciſes or Stamps then exiſt; and yet that Queen during her long reign ſhewed no ſmall vigour both in defence and offence. Let the military efforts, exerted by Queen Elizabeth, at the head of 4 millions of ſubjects, with Scotland and Ireland ſo far from aiding her, hanging as heavy bur-

dens upon her, and without any Weſt Indian or Eaſt Indian reſources, be compared with the military efforts of Great Britain and Ireland during the preſent war, enjoying both Weſt Indian and Eaſt Indian reſources, and a population exceeding 13 millions of people, and it will be hard to decide, whether the former were any way inferior to the latter, in proportion to their reſpective funds, and the duration of the efforts. The foreign enemy of Queen Elizabeth was among the moſt formidable powers in Europe; but ſo far were the people of England then from being panic ſtruck with the Grand Armada, they encountered it with an undaunted ſpirit at ſea, and prepared with an equal ſpirit to encounter it at land. The Engliſh nobility and gentry came forward both with their purſes and perſons, on the principle, that their own ſafety and the ſafety of the ſtate were inſeparable *. So far was her revenue from

* I cannot here omit taking notice of the nobleneſs of ſpirit of Lord Romney, who in the Houſe of Lords, on the 27th of laſt March, propoſed, inſtead of a Public Loan, to ſupport government by a general ſubſcription, to which he offered to contribute 5000l. In Ireland, likewiſe, we lately have inſtances of an equal public ſpirit. On the debate on a loan for this year in the Houſe of Commons of that kingdom, Mr. Bagwell ſaid, that rather than agree to a loan, he would give for the ſupport of government the fourth of what he was worth, as long as the ſtate ſhould need it. Mr. Brown, another member likewiſe oppoſing the loan, ſaid, that he would not lend, but give to government a ſum without debenture, without treaſury bill, or any other ſecurity. Theſe gentlemen, whether from the knowledge of the true principle of ſupply, or from a momentary and very laudable zeal, have preciſely hit the right nail on the head. There needs nothing more to prevent all future public loans, but that

from being exhauſted by her perpetual ſtruggles for forty years, that her treaſury frequently overflowed, and ſhe even declined accepting ſubſidies that were offered to her by Parliament. Upon enquiring into the chief ſources of that revenue, we find that they conſiſted in the monied value of the produce of the ſoil, paid either by the direct tenants of the Crown, or by the land owners, in Parliamentary ſubſidies or feudal ſervices. No Exciſes, no Stamps, nor any of the taxes enumerated by Kearſley, made part of that revenue. The poſſibility of defending the kingdom in great emergencies, by means of a land tax, without any of thoſe taxes, and without burdenſome loans, muſt therefore be admitted.

The Saxons, it appears from the Hiſtory of England, by their trinoda neceſſitas, or three-fold obligation, laid the charge of defending the ſtate on the poſſeſſors of land. It was a fundamental law among them, that all the lands of the kingdom, even thoſe that were held by eccleſiaſtics and women were ſubject to three public duties, the building and repairing of forts and caſtles, the building and repairing of bridges, and the military expedition, which three duties, or trinoda neceſſitas *nulli unquam relaxari poteſt*, can be forgiven to no man.

From the conſtitution eſtabliſhed by William the Conqueror, which in its fundamentals remained unaltered till the 12th year of Charles the Second's reign,

that every proprietor of land in Great Britain and Ireland ſhould adopt the ſpirit of Lord Romney, of Mr. Bagwell, and of Mr. Brown, and act accordingly. When the land proprietors ſhall connect themſelves more with government, and government ſhall diſconnect itſelf more from the money lenders, the athletic vigour of the nation will increaſe, and all apprehenſion of a financial convulſion will vaniſh.

the

the defence of the kingdom was placed wholly upon the revenue of land, exclusive of the trifling supply which the Customs yielded. But was England then in a state of weakness, because it had no Excises, no Stamps, nor any of that variety of taxes mentioned in Kearsley's Tables. Far otherwise. The constitutional defence of England was then very great, and its King one of the richest and most powerful Monarchs in Europe. A contemporary author mentions, that the daily receipt of his Exchequer exceeded 1000l. sterling of that age, or above 3000l. of the present money *. Another author, ancestor of the present Earl Fortescue, and contemporary with Edward the Fourth, speaking of the revenues of that King after he had made a resumption of the Crown lands that had been fraudulently alienated, says, 'The King our sovereyng Lord had by tymes sithing 'he reigned upon us live-loode in Lordshippis lands, 'tenements, and rents, nere hand to the value of 'the fifth part of his realm, above the possessions of 'the chirche.' What, then, should hinder Great Britain from being rich and powerful, were it now to abolish all the present chaos of taxes, and revert to the same source of supply, which formerly sufficed for all its exigencies, and which probably in those times, from the unimproved state of the lands, was a source not half so abundant as it would now prove. By the constitution of England established at the conquest, which remained its constitution, till it was most impolitically overturned in the 12th year of

* See the Hist. of the Pub. Rev. of the Brit. Empire, vol. I. p. 44, 45.

Charle

Charles the 2d. by the act for the abolition of tenures, every poſſeſſor of lands was bound to give a regulated part of his income for the defence of the ſtate; and if he neglected to give that regulated part, he in conſequence forfeited his lands. Baron Gilbert, in his treatiſe on the Exchequer, ſays, in conformity to many authorities, 'Whoever held lands by Knights 'ſervice, and failed coming to attend the King in 'arms, according to the array that was made on 'every expedition, or failed to render his quota of 'men according to his tenure, his lands were origi-'nally liable to be ſeized into the King's hands for 'not doing his duty.' The poſſeſſion of land, and the duty were inſeparably connected together; and notwithſtanding the duty, which ſometimes exceeded four ſhillings and five ſhillings in the pound, the grant of the land was called *Beneficium*, or a Kindneſs.

It is then moſt evident that this ſingle tribute or ſingle land-tax did not appear an abſurd thing either to the Anglo-ſaxon monarchs, or to thoſe who immediately ſucceeded them, ſince they placed the whole of the defence of the kingdom upon it. The feudal ſyſtem, which confirmed that mode of taxation, was in its very nature a ſyſtem of union, calling upon all land poſſeſſors, wherever ſituated within the dominions of the Sovereign, to aſſiſt him in defending the ſtate in proportion to the landed property they poſſeſſed. Thus Henry the 2d, when he obtained poſſeſſion of Ireland, firmly and irrevocably united that iſland to England by the fiefs and benefices which he there eſtabliſhed, *holding of the Crown*

of

of England *. That is to say, he conferred the same rights and the same privileges upon his new subjects in Ireland as those of England possessed, and precisely the same burdens, likewise, upon the land owners of both countries. The taxes placed by the feudal system upon the produce of land were precisely the same in both islands, and the tenants in capite, whose lands lay in Ireland, were bound by their tenures to give their fixed supplies to the Crown of England. In point of taxation, there was not one law for the land possessors in England, and another for those of Ireland, but both paid proportionably upon the same scale †. This

* The grants of lands in Ireland by the successors of Henry II. were held by the same tenure. The Butlers received the county of Ormond from Edward III. *as a fief of the Crown of England.* Fitz Eustace received the Barony of Castle-martin, in the county of Kildare, from Edward IV. *as a fief of the Crown of England.* Donald M'Arty More, in 1565, accepted of his lands from Queen Elizabeth, to hold them *as a fief of England.* Queen Elizabeth also gave to Sur le Boy, four estates in the county of Antrim, with the castle of Dunluce, as a fief of the Kings of England, &c. &c. See Sir John Davis.

† The subject of the American dispute always appeared to me to be most completely misunderstood by both parties in Great Britain, as well as by the revolters in America, from the true principle of government supply being misunderstood or gone into oblivion. Had that principle been known and attended to by those who drew up the Colony Charters, a permanent connection might have been formed between the mother country and the colonies, profitable yet unvexatious to both. About the commencement of the dispute, it was recommended to Lord North, as a means of restoring quiet and contentment, and as a permanent bond of union between the mother country and the colonies, to grant to the latter an entire liberty of foreign commerce, and an assurance of perpetual exemption of all taxation from the mother country, on condition that they should triple

their

This ſolves the hitherto unſolvable riddle of the Iriſh peers ſitting in the parliaments of England. As thoſe peers held their fiefs of the crown of England, they took their ſeats in the parliament of England as poſſeſſors of thoſe fiefs; and to have talked of a peer of one country being a commoner in the other, would then have been deemed the moſt abſurd of all political ſoleciſms. The king of the Iriſh ever ſince the time of Henry II. is he who wears the crown of England; and ſo ſenſible were the Iriſh of this fundamental truth, that they even eſtabliſhed it when they were eſpouſing the cauſe of an impoſtor; for Lambert Simnel, when he met with little countenance elſewhere, went to Dublin, where he was, with much ſolemnity, crowned king, not of Ireland, but of England. The Iriſh were then ſenſible of their relation to England, which ſtill remains unaltered, and is ſtedfaſtly ſupported by thoſe who underſtand the conſtitution of both countries.

But it was not in England and Ireland alone that the ſyſtem of the Economiſts, in regard to taxation, was anciently eſtabliſhed. In Scotland, when the Queen Regent, in 1555, propoſed to raiſe a tax

their quit rents for the general defence of the empire. Henry the Second, if America had been ſettled in his time, would probably have colonized it, as he connected Ireland with England. But the legal ignorance of the conſtitutional nature of tenures that prevailed throughout the laſt century, added to the ſelfiſh ſpirit of mercantile monopoly, led government into the abſurdity of eſtabliſhing the colonies by ſoccage tenures, and limiting their foreign trade.

upon property in general, the gentry with much ſpirit obliged her to drop the deſign, ſaying, that as for ages paſt the defence of the country had lain upon them, there was no occaſion for any alteration. Did not the ſame ſyſtem in former times prevail in France, in Germany, in Italy, and indeed over all Europe. Does not China at this moment adopt it! Has it not exiſted for ages in the empire of the Mogul. Do not at this day two-thirds of the revenue of Bengal ariſe from a tax upon the produce of the ſoil? Was any other tax known in that province, when it came under the power of Great Britain? And did not the firſt introduction of the tax upon ſalt occaſion much murmuring and much diſtreſs among the inhabitants, when according to the principles of the Economiſts, and the eſtabliſhed mode of that country, the whole of the ſupplies ought to have been drawn from the zemindars, the receivers of rents, though not the proprietors of lands, the ſovereign being the only proprietor. Even among ourſelves, about the period of the Revolution, a direct land-tax formed one-half of the taxes of England, though now making ſo ſmall a proportion of the general amount of thoſe taxes. And in Scotland, at the time of the Union, about one-third of its public revenue conſiſted in a land-tax.

The preceding hiſtorical obſervations I think moſt clearly evince that the ſyſtem of the Economiſts, in regard to taxation, is no new impracticable theory. It is at this moment practiſed in countries of great extent, and in England, both before and after the Conqueſt, it was the ſyſtem by which the national

national supplies were regulated. The principle of that system has formerly in England been supported with great strictness; for it has been the repeated decision of lawyers, that should the king grant a tenure in the express words, *absque aliquid inde reddendo;* yet the law would imply a military duty; and in the Abbot of St. Bartholomew's case, in the 14th of Henry VI. upon a grant made in the words, *tenendum si frankement come le Roy est en son corone*, it was decreed, that the patentee was not exempt from military service.

This service was commonly termed, *servitium consuetum et debitum*, the accustomed and bounden service, or duty incumbent upon those who were the possessors of land. How this *bounden duty* came not to *bind*, during the four or five succeeding centuries, is a subject worthy of being amply discussed by some philosophical historian, as it has never yet been treated of with such attention as it deserves*. How came William the Conqueror, who

* Sir John Dalrymple, not many years ago, published an Essay on Feudal Property, in which his claim of having treated the subject like a scholar and a gentleman will be most readily admitted. But ought he not likewise to have treated it as a politician? His researches seem confined to the investigation of the ever changing rights of the feudal tenants, who, aided by the subtlety of lawyers, were continually endeavouring to evade their obligations to the crown, and, at the same time, to rivet their oppressive claims upon their inferior vassals, many of which claims they retain to this very hour. In the consideration of feudal property, the first point to have been investigated was, what property belonged inalienably to the crown, next, the nature of the property belonging to the subject,

who had about five millions a year, and Edward IV. who had near four millions a year, to be succeeded by a King James and a King Charles, who had not much above half a million a year, though there was no conſtitutional alteration in the financical ſyſtem from the firſt of theſe monarchs to the laſt, and the monied value of commodities was riſen three fold.

The firſt cauſe of this depredation of royal revenue appears to have been the ſupine negligence of ſome of our kings, who not conſidering that by the conſtitution they really were but life poſſeſſors, gave away with both hands what they had no right to give away. What by Domeſday Book was *terra regis*, or kings land to Edward the Confeſſor, became kings land to William the Conqueror, who is ſaid to have poſſeſſed in royal domain 1,200 manors, which ſucceſſively became the right of the kings who reigned after him. But of thoſe 1,200 manors, Charles I. probably did not poſſeſs 100, all the others having been alienated by the impolicy of his predeceſſors. A ſecond cauſe of the depredation of royal revenue was the ſchool-boy notion of

ject, and for what cauſe, or for what expected ſervices it was beſtowed. If Sir John had taken but half the pains to elucidate the *Duties* of the feudal tenants that he has taken in treating of their *Rights*, he would have rendered his ingenious eſſay much more valuable. What he uniformly deems progreſs was in reality a degradation of the conſtitution then ſubſiſting. The feudal ſyſtem was a Public Edifice whoſe pins and mortiſes were daily weakening, and from whoſe roof ſome tiles were every year moſt knaviſhly ſtolen, to cover caſtles of private deſpotiſm.

eſtimating

eſtimating wealth not by its phyſical uſe, but by its preſent value in money, and upon that notion agreeing to a permanent commutation of revenue in kind for revenue in preſent money to remain unalterable; in conſequence of which the king of Great Britain now receives for ſome lands one penny, in lieu of what ſells in the market at preſent for five ſhillings. A third cauſe was the unwatchfulneſs of thoſe who ought to have guarded the king's revenue, and thereby ſuffering the moſt fraudulent entries to be made by the feudal tenants. A fourth cauſe, and the laſt I ſhall mention, was the unremitting endeavours of the feudal tenants to ſmuggle and conceal the number and value of their fees, ſo that in leſs than 300 years after the Conqueſt, the number of them was diminiſhed above one-half; and in Charles the Firſt's time they hardly amounted to one-fourth of what they had been in the time of William the Conqueror, and theſe often rated at leſs than one-tenth of their real income. Mr. Philips, in his very curious treatiſe, entitled, *Tenenda non Tollenda*, written in 1660, againſt the abolition of the feudal tenures, and abounding with legal knowledge, gives the following inſtance of two of thoſe ſmuggled eſtates: 'An eſtate,' he ſays, 'in 'the reign of Charles I. above 1000l. per annum, 'hath been found (by the Eſcheators) to be but of 'the yearly value of twenty marks. Another eſtate, 'conſiſting of very few manors and as few copy-'holders, but moſt in farms and demeſnes, upon 'an improved and almoſt racked rent, worth 6000l. 'per annum, found at no greater yearly value than

' 183l. 11s. which is leſs than the 30th part.' Had the records of the Exchequer, for ſucceſſive reigns, been faithfully kept, and were they ſtill preſerved unimpaired, who knows but among the land ſmugglers of the reign of Charles I. might be found John Hampden, and others of the violent oppoſitioniſts of thoſe times, ſo clamorous for a redreſs of grievances, the chief of which they themſelves occaſioned by unconſtitutionally withholding their *debita ſervitia*, or bounden ſervices from government. What ſhould we think of the tenants of a Duke of Bedford, who ſhould combine to pay him only one-tenth or one-thirtieth of what was ſtipulated in their leaſes, or ſhould burn their leaſes, and deny to pay him any thing. But ſuch tenants to the crown of England, and to the crown of Scotland, were the majority of the land proprietors of Great Britain in the reign of Charles the Firſt. They had not only ſtripped the crown of almoſt all the royal domains, but had ſhaken off their obligations to defend the ſtate, by which they had rendered themſelves from an *eſſential claſs*, one of the moſt *uneſſential claſſes* of ſociety.

Theſe unconſtitutional and diſhoneſt practices of the land proprietors, leaving King Charles the Firſt with hardly any revenue, that ill adviſed monarch not having the political prudence and fortitude to withſtand ſuch fraudulent violations of the conſtitution, had recourſe to illegal means of ſupply, which were the ſource of many calamities to the nation. But no one acquainted with the Engliſh hiſtory will affirm that the calamities that then overwhelmed

whelmed the nation had no other ſource beſides the king's illegal conduct. The conſtitution was not more violated by Charles, than by the acts and proceedings of thoſe who with much bitterneſs were contending for *rights*, without ſaying one word about *duties*. Would not Charles the Firſt, when he granted the Petition of Rights, have been ſupported by the conſtitution, if he had addreſſed the parliament to the following purpoſe: 'It gives me 'great pleaſure to have eſtabliſhed the rights of my 'people, but I muſt repreſent to you that the 'crown alſo has its rights, and I expect this par-'liament to confirm thoſe rights. The Doomſday 'Book ſhews us that my predeceſſor, William the 'Firſt, had in royal domain twelve hundred man-'ors; now as there is by law no preſcription againſt 'the crown, it muſt be allowed that all thoſe man-'ors belong to me. Beſides, as many frauds have 'been committed by changing military tenures for 'other holdings, and by great undervaluations of 'eſtates upon the deaths of tenants in capite, I 'deſire the parliament may appoint a committee to 'enquire into the defrauders of the public revenue, 'and to form a bill, to which I will give my aſſent, 'for preventing ſuch frauds in future, that the 'defence of the nation may be put upon its old 'conſtitutional footing.' In ſuch an addreſs the king certainly would not have talked unconſtitutionally; but his deſpotic and tyrannic temper, and his overweening notion of the uncontrolable ſupremacy of the kingly office, and perhaps a deſire of copying after the example of his brother-in-law in

France, who had been taxing his ſubjects for twenty-two years, without the authority of the ſtates of his kingdom, led Charles to purſue other meaſures. The king's faults however by no means rendered the land ſmugglers faultleſs.

The mutual diſlikes proceeding to animoſities, both parties had recourſe to arms, without either of them being able clearly to define upon what grounds they were fighting. But had the principles of the Economiſts been then underſtood by king and people, thoſe bloody contentions needed not to have taken place; for by thoſe principles not only the nature and ſource of the public ſupply would have been manifeſt to the whole nation, but the beſt mode of collecting it likewiſe; and all the alteration neceſſary for obtaining a free conſtitution would have been to have made the grants annual, according to the diſcretion of parliament, and the actual circumſtances of the time, and the executive power accountable for the expenditure.

The iſſue of the fatal conteſt was the murder of the king, by a ſentence in direct violation of law; and a ſucceſſion of his chief murderer a few years afterwards to the deſpotic rule of the nation. Under the iron rod of this deſpot the ſupplies for national defence were collected without rule or meaſure by military compulſion; and, by various extortions, more money was raiſed by him in one year than had been raiſed by the murdered ſovereign in three years.

Upon the reſtoration of Charles II. when it was ſuppoſed the ancient laws were reſtored with him,

and

and likewiſe the ancient mode of ſupply, it might have been expected that the parliament, from the experience of paſt troubles, would have adopted ſuch means as might prevent land ſmuggling in future; and while it renewed the obligation of the land poſſeſſors to furniſh their debita ſervitia, or bounden ſervices, in ſome better mode than by feudal tenures, would at the ſame time have laid the executive power under ſome obligation to apply thoſe debita ſervitia to the defence and honour of the nation. Parliament however adopted a meaſure altogether different, and not more contrary to the ſpirit of the conſtitution than to the dictates of ſound policy. By the moſt abſurd and unconſtitutional act for the abolition of tenures, it wholly exempted the land poſſeſſors from all direct ſupplies whatever; and in commutation for what ought by the former conſtitution, as well as by the dictates of juſt policy, to have been drawn directly from the produce of land, it annexed hereditarily to the crown an exciſe duty on beer and ale, amounting not to one-twentieth of what by the old conſtitution was required from the owners of land. This was a no leſs violent than impolitic innovation *. By diſſolv-

* Among the many unconſtitutional and oppreſſive expedients of ſupply adopted by the long parliament, the exciſe had been introduced by them, in imitation of the practice of Holland, which in this point had attracted the curioſity of many in England in the time of James I. who is ſaid to have ſent over a perſon thither to enquire into the manner and management of it. About that time it was by the Engliſh ſtiled *Heathen Greek*, and was moſt generally reprobrated by them.

ing the *nexus adictiſſimus*, or bond of moſt ſtrict obligation, it threw the land owners into the claſs of mere idlers, a claſs ever to be avoided by a well conſtituted ſociety; and it introduced a new mode of taxation, rather prejudicial, in many caſes, to the nation at large, and no leſs burdenſome to numbers of individuals, than the feudal ſervices had been to the feudal tenants. I may likewiſe add, as it has ſince proved, no leſs intricate and perplexing in the modes of raiſing it, than the incidents of the feudal tenures ever had been. As a ſupplement to this firſt exciſe duty, the parliament granted an aſſeſſment upon the lands in the different counties; but inſtead of impoſing it in a juſt proportion to the fund to be taxed, (which is the fundamental principle of all equitable taxation) it was rated negligently and inaccurately, in conſequence of which ſome muſt have been too much charged, while others were too much eaſed.

At the era of the Revolution the parliament nobly reverted to the ſyſtem of nature, in regard to public ſupplies, and eſtabliſhed a land-tax ſufficient not only for the peace eſtabliſhment, but as has been proved in pages 84 and 85, for the exigencies of an expenſive war likewiſe; had the tax been levied in exact proportion to the value of the rents upon which it was impoſed. The Economiſts affirm that the produce of the land is the only fund for national ſupplies. The parliament at the Revolution made a great ſtep towards this important truth, when by eſtabliſhing a land-tax at four ſhillings in the pound, they declared the produce of land to be

the

the chief fund for taxation. Eſt quoddam prodire tenus*. Why they omitted the principle of impoſing that tax in a juſt proportion to the reſpective rents, it may be now impoſſible to determine; but that ſuch a principle ſhould at this moment be neglected in the eſtabliſhment of a land-tax, is a great reproach to theſe enlightened times, and a great injuſtice to the majority of the land proprietors of the kingdom. A deviation from this principle in other matters, with the pretence of adhering to it, would be deemed no leſs ridiculous than unjuſt. In this reſpect the modern acts for the land-tax may be conſidered as political bulls of no ſmall magnitude. They eſtabliſhed diſproportion almoſt in the ſame paragraphs, where they enact that juſt proportion ſhall be obſerved; as if a landed gentleman ſhould ſay to his tenants, I mean that you ſhould pay me your rents in a juſt proportion to the ſize of your farms, that is, I require a certain quantity of wheat from each of your wheat fields, whether the field be large or ſmall, and a certain quantity of apples from each of your orchards, whether the orchard be large or ſmall, or whether the crop be ſcanty or plentiful. It would be readily allowed that this gentleman was not very accurate in his notions of proportion. But nearly ſimilar is the ſpirit of the preſent acts for raiſing a land-tax in Great

* From what is here remarked, as well as from what is above written, it moſt evidently appears, that Mr. Pitt, and thoſe who voted with him, in the affair of the Legacy Bill, acted more in conformity to the Revolution principles of taxation than thoſe who oppoſed that bill.

Britain. From ſome they require only four-pence, and from ſome four ſhillings, by the ſame rule of proportion; nay, from ſome not even four-pence; for I can declare, upon good information, that a gentleman poſſeſſing an eſtate of 5,000l. a year, in one of the northern counties of England, pays in land-tax, at four ſhillings in the pound, only 75l. The undervaluation from a real four ſhillings in the pound on this ſingle eſtate, if it had been brought to account in the Exchequer, ſince the Revolution, with the compound intereſt thence ariſing, would have liquidated upwards of one million of the national debt. We may thence diſcover the radical cauſe why the nation is at preſent ſo much involved, for if the deficiency upon a ſingle eſtate of 5,000l. a year, would have ſufficed to have paid off one million of the national debt; it would not be a ſtrained concluſion to affirm, without any farther computation, that the ſum total of the undervaluations of the land-tax upon the eſtates of the whole kingdom, would have paid off the whole national debt.

As the number of landed gentleman that are aggrieved by the preſent very diſproportionate aſſeſſment of the land-tax far exceeds the number of thoſe that are thereby unjuſtly favoured, it is moſt reaſonable that this unfair advantage of the minority ſhould give way to that of the majority. This majority therefore have a right to preſs for an equal valuation of the land-tax without delay, that the minority, who are now exempt, may bear an equal ſhare of the public burdens with themſelves. The

equal

equal valuation of the aſſeſſment, and the rate of the aſſeſſment, are two very different things, and ought ever to be kept diſtinct. The latter depends upon the diſcretion of parliament, but the former is founded on a ſtronger authority than that of parliament, the immutable law of right and wrong, to which law parliament ought ever ſtudiouſly to conform.

Leaving the rate of the aſſeſſment, as it ought to be, indeterminate, unleſs by an annual law of parliament, I ſhall here confine myſelf to the means of obtaining its equal valuation. For this purpoſe there is no need of a new Doomſday Book, or any intricate mode of inveſtigation. As the knowledge of the value of the fund is the ſine qua non for obtaining a proportionate rate, and as the leaſes to tenants, whether annual or for a term of years, diſcover that fund, let all leaſes of whatever kind be regiſtered in the reſpective counties where the lands are ſituated; and let the aſſeſſments be made for ſuch county according to thoſe regiſters. Whenever a leaſe is renewed, let the value of ſuch new leaſe be faithfully ſpecified and regiſtered within one month after its date, and publiſhed three times in the newſpaper of the county town, or in the London Gazette; and let the particular new aſſeſſment be made thereupon, by which eaſy and honeſt expedient, the income to government would riſe or fall in exact proportion as the income of the land proprietors roſe or fell; or rather as the income of the whole nation roſe or fell; for it is to be preſumed that the rents of lands will only riſe or decline as this laſt riſes or declines.

The

The regiſtration above propoſed would effect the ſame thing in politics, that logarithms have effected in mathematics. The now intricate and perplexing financial queſtions would thereby be rendered eaſy of ſolution. The aſſeſſment of the poor-rates ſuppoſes ſuch a notoriety in every pariſh in England; and the ſame notoriety is implied by the laws enjoining the payment of tythes; for that law could never have been put in effect with exactitude, were not every clergyman to be fully acquainted with the whole of the produce of his own pariſh. When England was divided into knights fees, and the owners of them were bound in return to defend the kingdom, the notoriety of thoſe fees was implied in the very inſtitution; and the corruption of that inſtitution proceeded from the neglect of notoriety, or the difficulty of obtaining it. The art of printing was then unknown, nay even the art of writing was almoſt unknown; there were no newſpapers, no turnpike roads, no regular poſtage of letters, conſequently, though notoriety was the principle of the inſtitution, deeds of darkneſs eaſily eſcaped detection, and defrauders annually increaſed, even with the connivance of the eſcheators, who were ſometimes only two for all England. The modern improvements in civil life, that have been juſt mentioned, would not only preclude in theſe times any fraudulent evaſions of the land-tax, but would render the levying of it a matter of the greateſt eaſe and correctneſs. Every county would have its receiver general reſiding in the county town, correſponding with the exchequer, and making his remittances

ittances thither; and the financial machine would : kept at leſs expence, would move with m ore accuracy, and would ſeldomer require repa irs and nendments, when thus compoſed only of a few heels, than as it is at preſent, clumſily formed of hundred wheels.

Having given an outline of the mode for e ſtabliſhg an equal valuation of the land-tax, I ſ hall proed to conſider a ſuperficial objection ofte n made ainſt ſuch a proportionate valuation, wh ich obction has ſerved as a ſtumbling block t o many ho ſincerely wiſh to ſee ſuch a proportio nate vaation take place. Many landed eſtates, it has een ſaid, have been purchaſed in counties w here the aluation of the land-tax is extremely low, upon the reſumption that no alteration of that ta x would ake place, and now to impoſe a higher ra te upon uch eſtates would be an injuſtice to their p oſſeſſors. But is it not an injuſtice in thoſe poſſeſſors, who njoy an equal protection of government with their eighbours, not to contribute to the ſuppo rt of gernment in an equal proportion with their neighbours. The *ſalus populi*, or the obligation of defence, is in its nature paramount to every other obligation. We have ſeen above, that in the feudal times a grant of land made with the expreſs condition of no ſervices, *tenendum ſi frankement come le roi eſt en ſon corone*, was nevertheleſs judged in law not to be exempt fram military ſervice; and the Saxons ſaid of their *trinoda neceſſitas*, or threefold obligation, *nulli unquam relaxari poteſt*, it can be forgiven to no man. Among the Romans likewiſe,

in

in the flouriſhing times of their republic, a fr
man who fraudulently avoided being enrolled in t
legions, when called upon by the conſul, was ma
a ſlave, and his property was confiſcated to the ſtat
Many purchaſes of landed eſtates were doubtl
made in England between the Reſtoration and t
Revolution; but when the aſſeſſment of the lan
tax, ſoon after the Revolution, was raiſed fro
600,000l. which it had been at the Reſtoration,
two millions, we do not find that thoſe new pu
chaſers were exempted in the new valuation. It
the protection of Government that renders a
man's eſtate valuable to him; and if in conſequenc
of this protection, an eſtate bought at twenty-fiv
years purchaſe ſhould (without any improvement
become ſaleable for thirty-five years purchaſe, g
vernment is certainly entitled to a retribution fo
ſuch a benefit. The riſe in value here ſpecifie
amounts to upwards of one-fourth; but ſhould a
eſtate now paying only four-pence in the pound, b
required to pay a full four ſhillings in the pound
that would not be quite one-fifth of augmentation
conſequently the benefit beſtowed by governmen
would exceed the retribution to government, whic
(excluſive of any riſe in marketable value of a
eſtate) would be entitled to four ſhillings in th
pound from it, if the other eſtates of the king
dom were rated at four ſhillings. But when go-
vernment by drawing the ſupplies from the direc
ſource ſhall become independant of the monied men
whoſe ſhackles it has worn theſe hundred years
paſt, the rate of intereſt will ſink to ſuch a degree
as

s will raiſe the marketable value of land in a greater proportion than I have above mentioned. To the objectors among the new purchaſers of eſtates at undervaluations, adminiſtration might then ſay, we will reimburſe you the full money you paid for your eſtates, and will reſel them, burdened with four ſhillings in the pound, confident that the exchequer will be a gainer by ſuch commutations. If the exchequer, as I think may be demonſtrated, would be a gainer by the commutations of ſuch eſtates, it would then be the intereſt of the preſent poſſeſſors of thoſe eſtates to avoid ſuch commutations. This is conſidering the ſubject in the light of the objectors, as a mere money tranſaction, in which light it appears that ſhould government maintain the nation in proſperity, the impoſition of four ſhillings in the pound, would really take nothing out of their pockets. But the neceſſity of defence, or in other words, of ſupplies for defence, places the ſubject in another light, in which though the objectors have not choſen to conſider it, the conſtitution muſt. A perſon who buys an eſtate does not only lay out his money in the purchaſe of land, but actually enliſts himſelf as a defender of the ſtate. We have ſeen above that government has actually been carried on, and conſequently may be carried on, without any of thoſe taxes, that are called taxes on conſumption. Now ſhould the Britiſh government revert to that natural ſyſtem, aboliſh all taxes on conſumption, and draw the public ſupplies from the direct ſource of ſupply, the produce of land, a land proprietor in ſuch circumſtances,

ſtan ces, ſitting exempt from a land-tax, wou
aſſiſt government no more than one of his ow
gro oms. Upon what principle then could ſuch
lan d proprietor expect the protection of gover
mt nt.

I ſhall conclude, at preſent, with one reflectio
n ore on this point. Were all our taxes on con
ſt mption ſuppreſſed, and the whole of the publi
ſ upplies, as in former times, to be raiſed from lanc
t he land proprietors would, nevertheleſs, ſtill remai
t he moſt opulent claſs in ſociety, as poſſeſſors o
the only aſſured ſurplus revenue in the community
Merchants and manufacturers, by many years aſſi
duous attention, may become rich; but they may
likewiſe, by many miſchances, become bankrupts
Thoſe who live upon ſtipends and ſalaries, are pre-
ſumed to have only a daily ſubſiſtence, correſpondent
to their reſpective ranks. In the preſent ſtate of
things, by the riſe of prices and the fixedneſs of
ſalaries, many of them have not even that daily
ſubſiſtence; and by the extinction of taxes on
conſumption, they might be enabled to live in eaſe,
but not in affluence. The great body of manual
labourers give their whole capital daily to the pub-
lic, without any reſerve of intereſt; conſequently,
when infirmity or old age overtakes them, inſtead of
having made accumulations, they are often in a ſtate of
deſtitution; and be the prices of things, or the rate
of wages what they may, this will ever be the caſe
with the great majority of them. Mental labourers,
though by their ideas, not only individuals, but

nations are often rendered rich, generally receive themſelves but a ſcanty retribution. Laudantur & Algent. The Britiſh hiſtory furniſhes many examples of the great opulence of our nobility and gentry, when no public taxes exiſted in this iſland but what were paid by themſelves; which taxes, in the eſtimation of the payers, were not even deemed taxes, but ſtiled by them ſervitium liberum, that is, the ſervice of a freeman. If ſuch was the caſe in former times, when the marketable value of eſtates was low, in conſequence of the rate of intereſt being ten per cent and upwards, it is reaſonable to expect, that upon a return to that ſyſtem, the landed gentlemen would be more diſtinguiſhed for their opulence, from the marketable value of their eſtates being high, in conſequence of the low rate of intereſt. Land, ſelling at thirty-ſix years purchaſe, is a capital three times more valuable than when ſold at twelve years purchaſe.

Having in the preceding part of this diſcourſe ſhewn that manufactures made and ſold at home, though they may enrich individuals, do not give any augmentation of national revenue, I ſhall here make a few obſervations in reſpect to the profit that accrues to the nation from that idol of modern times, foreign commerce. If our imports are of equal value to our exports, the national gain will be nothing; it will only be as if a crown-piece were exchanged for five ſhillings, or five ſhillings for a crown. In this ſtate of an equal balance between us and our foreign cuſtomers, though the nation

may

may be no gainer, yet our own merchants, and thoſe of foreign countries who ſell our merchandize, may be great gainers, by putting 30, or 40, or 50 per cent upon the retail of the merchandize imported by them, and ſold to their fellow-ſubjects. Thus the Eaſt-India company may gain annually 800,000 l. upon the ſale of their teas, though the nation may thereby not gain a ſingle farthing. This private gain, and others of the like kind, are too often maſtakenly deemed national gains, though in ſome certain caſes (as in the caſe of tea ſome years ago) the nation is actually a loſer by them. The real national gain, therefore, cannot be eſtimated from the moſt accurate ſtatements of the inſpector general of the cuſtoms, nor from the magnitude of the exports, if the magnitude of the imports keeps pace with it. To ſettle this balance clearly, very many circumſtances are neceſſary to be taken into the account; and till thoſe circumſtances be minutely underſtood, the deciſions in regard to the profit from foreign commercial dealings muſt be very inaccurate. Should this profit, in reſpect of Great Britain, amount annually to five or ſix millions, though it may be doubted whether it riſes ſo high, that profit, in compariſon of the other part of the national revenue ariſing from agriculture, would not be ſo conſiderable as to juſtify the great importance annexed to it in the minds of the multitude, and far leſs to juſtify government in engaging in war in compliance with the avaricious ſpirit of thoſe who wiſh to extend their gains by unlawful

and

and unjuſt means *. From the continual cry in the mouths of ſome, *We are a commercial nation*, one would be inclined to think, that they believed the chief ſource of the riches and proſperity of Great Britain was her foreign trade; that without foreign trade poverty and diſtreſs would overſpread the land, nothing but miſery would be known, and Great Britain would loſe her preponderance among the nations of the earth; therefore, every intereſt ſhould give way to the intereſt of foreign trade. Whoever rightly underſtands the principles of the Economiſts, will ſee no neceſſity for ſuch gloomy forebodings, even on the ſuppoſition of no foreign trade. The Economiſts, however, are far from ſaying, Periſh our commerce; or from wiſhing to adopt the ſyſtem of the antient Egyptians, who prohibited foreign trade; or applying to Great Bri-

* What we tranſlate *Good-will towards men* (Luke 11 and 14) may, perhaps, be as juſtly rendered *Good-will among men*. This Chriſtian good-will among men has but too often been interrupted by a ſelfiſh ſpirit among dealers, of monopolizing foreign markets to themſelves, at the hazard of prejudice to the national welfare. The frequent captures of Engliſh ſhips by the Spaniſh guarda coſta's greatly irritated the Britiſh nation, and occaſioned the war with Spain in 1739. But it may be doubted whether both nations were not betrayed into hoſtilities by the avarice and artifice of our South Sea Company. From a perſon that reſided ſeven years at Carthagena and other places in Spaniſh America, before the breaking-out of that war, I have been told that the Spaniſh guarda coſta's, that would otherwiſe have remained inactive, were privately excited by our S. S. Company to make ſeizure of Engliſh ſhips, who, as interlopers, ſold goods to the Spaniſh coloniſts cheaper than the Company ſold them.

tain the late Biſhip Berkeley's maxim in regard to Ireland, and ſaying, Great Britain might be happy and proſperous, though it were to be ſurrounded by a wall of braſs 40 cubits high.

The Economiſts ſee not only national profit in foreign commerce rightly conducted, but a great augmentation of the conveniencies and enjoyments of human life. They, nevertheleſs, conſider foreign commerce as an object of very little regard as to revenue, in compariſon with that ariſing from the cultivation of territory; and deem a ſtate poſſeſſing an ample territory to be exceedingly miſled and ill-adviſed, that beſtows more of its attention upon commerce than upon agriculture, ſince this laſt is a much more ample and more ſubſtantial ſupport of national opulence and power than the former.

Many falſe principles of writers on commerce might here be quoted, but I ſhall mention only one. Great Britain, ſays one of thoſe writers ſeventy years ago, could no more expect to get rich without the balance of trade in her favour, than a family could get rich, the maſter of which had no other occupation than winning the money of his wife and children at play. In this writer's idea, then, which has ſerved as a miſleading doctrine to thouſands, Great Britain could not increaſe in opulence and proſperity without acquiring ſomething from her neighbours more than ſhe gives them. Were this doctrine true in regard to Great Britain, it would likewiſe be true in regard to other nations that have foreign traffic; and they ſhould all direct their views to acquire ſomething from their neighbours

more than they give them. As it is impoſſible they ſhould all ſucceed in this, the conſequence of commercial dealings between different nations would then be, according to that falſe ſyſtem, that while ſome of them were thereby enriched, others of them muſt thereby be impoveriſhed. By that ſyſtem, all the commercial nations of the earth are conſidered as ſo many gameſters, each endeavouring to make itſelf rich by making its neighbours poor; and what can be expected from this but continual jealouſies, diſlikes, and animoſities, rendering nations unfriendly, and but too frequently hoſtile to each other. The Economiſts, on the other hand, whoſe leading principle is *Good-will among men*, affirm, that all the nations of the earth may traffic together with mutual advantage, without acquiring from each other more than they give to each other; and that Great Britain may daily advance in wealth and proſperity, without gaining one farthing by her foreign trade, however extenſive that may be, provided ſhe gives her attention to acquire every year additional wealth from her territory and her ſeas.

Do manufactures afford no revenue, and does foreign commerce yield but a ſmall income—and do we poſſeſs what furniſhes the natural income of a ſtate, an extenſive and fertile territory not much more than half cultivated, are we not then called upon by true policy to increaſe the wealth and power of the ſtate by rendering this territory more productive. It is to this new Potoſi, this mine of riches, that the Economiſts wiſh to direct the attention of Britiſh patriots, and Britiſh agriculturiſts.

Here permanent wealth may be acquired without the ſword, without the envy or moleſtation of our neighbours, accompanied with the increaſe of people, the leſſening of taxes to individuals, but the augmentation of them to the ſtate, and with the diminution of the number of poor, not by death, but by transferring them into the claſs of thoſe living in eaſy and comfortable circumſtances.

As the produce of the territory of a ſtate is the natural ſupport of its government, it becomes, therefore, the duty of government to eſtabliſh ſuch regulations as may contribute to render that territory as productive as poſſible. The dominium utile of the lands is ſecured to the poſſeſſors by government; but the dominium regale, inherent in government, is paramount to the other, and gives to government a right of inſpection and direction over the whole. No land proprietor, in civil ſociety, is entitled to ſay he may do with his eſtate what he pleaſes; becauſe, ſhould he, from obſtinacy or negligence, omit to render his lands productive, the ſtate is thereby ſo far endamaged, and conſequently has a right to take ſuch meaſures as may prevent that damage. This renders evident the great importance and neceſſity of the bill for the diviſion and improvement of the commons and waſte lands of Great Britain. By paſſing that bill (the fruits of the aſſiduous labours of the Board of Agriculture) into a law, the legiſlature will directly enlarge its own revenues, as well as thoſe of individuals, and will thereby as much increaſe the power and

opulence

opulence of the nation, as if a fertile iſland half as large as Ireland were united to its territory.

But it is not only neglected lands, but the neglected cultivators of thoſe lands, that call for the interpoſition and protection of government. The legiſlature, by taking upon itſelf the noble occupation of exempting from thraldom the poor and induſtrious country labourers, would, in fact, be only looking more particularly after its own intereſts, for the latter muſt ſuffer in proportion as the former are oppreſſed. The nation is very much obliged to Sir John Sinclair, who, by his aſſiduous and patriotic labours, has been inſtrumental in bringing to the knowledge of the public the grievances and oppreſſions ſuffered by many of thoſe cultivators in the northern parts of the iſland. There is hardly one of the many judicious and humane writers of the ſtatiſtical account of Scotland, whoſe pariſh is in the northern and mountainous parts, who does not enumerate among the diſadvantages that agriculture there labours under, the high rents, and the want of ſecurity to the farmers in the poſſeſſion of their farms.

In regard to high rents it may be obſerved, that, according to the ſyſtem of the Economiſts, government ought always to feel an immediate benefit from them, or from any riſe of rent whatever. In that caſe, the malady and the remedy would go together, and the people at large would more willingly pay double for their bread and their butchers-meat, when they perceived the income of government was thereby proportionably increaſed, and

conſequently the leſs would be demanded from them through the means of other taxes. But when they find the prices of their bread and butchers-meat raiſed upon them without any alleviation in other taxes, the moderate naturally conclude that there is miſgovernment ſomewhere, and the factious that government is to blame; when, in fact, it is government that is injured, as well as the community at large. A landed proprietor, who raiſes the rents of his farms without any actual improvement of them, what elſe does he do but aſſume the unconſtitutional power of taxing his fellow-ſubjects without conſent of Parliament, and his farmers are his tax-gatherers. When theſe aſk ten-pence for a pound of butter which they formerly ſold for five-pence, or demand ſix-pence for a pound of cheeſe which they before ſold for a groat, and ſell their corn and cattle proportionably dearer, what apology can they give for theſe new taxations but that they are compelled to impoſe them, becauſe their landlord has aſked ſo much more of them.

The riſe of rents from a real improvement of the ſoil, and augmentation of its produce, is to be viewed in a quite different light. This riſe of rents is a principal object of the Economiſts. It enlarges the powers of the main wheel, that moves every other wheel in ſociety, and is itſelf ſet in motion by nature and the induſtry of man. As the motion of that wheel is progreſſive or retrograde, ſo, proportionally, is the proſperity of the ſtate progreſſive or retrograde. A riſe of rents after this manner ought as much to be encouraged by government,

vernment, as the other manner of raiſing rents ought to be condemned. How common is it to find thoſe two very different meanings of the word improvement confounded together, not only by ſuperficial reaſoners, but by men who might be expected never to loſe ſight of the diſtinction between them. A man who has raiſed his eſtate, without any improvement of the ſoil, from 500l. a year to 1000l. makes no difficulty of ſaying he has improved his eſtate. But has he thereby improved the eſtate of the nation? By no means. He has only taxed the manufacturers and labourers in his neighbourhood, and rendered living more hard to them, till they overtake him by raiſing their prices and wages upon him, which reſtores all of them to the relative ſituation they were in before; when, ſhould a new riſe of rents in the former manner take place, the ſtrife between them is recommenced without any benefit accruing from thence to the nation.

The increaſe of produce, and not the increaſe of the price of produce, is what a wiſe agricultural nation will chiefly aim at; and when this becomes the principal object of the land owners of Great Britain, the increaſe of their incomes will then be a certain proof of the flouriſhing ſtate of the nation. The more they raiſe their rents after this manner, the more the people will have occaſion to rejoice, as eaſineſs of living and general abundance will be the conſequence.

The nation, in general, being greatly intereſted that the rents of lands ſhould be raiſed after this

manner, the legiſlature is therefore bound to purſue ſuch meaſures as may remove every obſtruction that prevents its taking place. And as one of the chief obſtructions to the increaſe of national produce, upon which the public proſperity ſo much depends, is the want of leaſes, that is, the want of ſecurity to the cultivator in his farm, the legiſlature, therefore, poſſeſſes the right of enforcing the granting of leaſes throughout the whole kingdom.

It was well obſerved by a member of the laſt parliament, who has wide eſtates in that part of the iſland where the grievance of the want of leaſes is moſt ſeverely felt, that agriculture ought to be under regulation as well as commerce. And certainly nothing can be a more diſgraceful and abſurd policy in an agricultural nation, than that great numbers of owners of land ſhould from negligence, miſtaken avarice, or a luſt of domination, be ſuffered ſo to let their land as to prevent the general yearly revenue of the ſtate from augmenting twenty or thirty millions, more eſpecially when by letting their lands upon leaſes thoſe very owners of land would probably ſoon greatly augment their preſent incomes. The moſaical law forbad the ox that treaded out the corn to be muzzled; but in ſome parts of Great Britain the cultivators themſelves are muzzled; their labour, though yielding ſuſtenance to others, not yielding ſuſtenance to themſelves and families. This impolicy and inhumanity having long prevailed, has compelled many of them to become cultivators in America, from whence perhaps they have lately been inſtrumental

mental in relieving our wants, thereby draining the money out of the kingdom, when by a different policy they might have been adding both to its wealth and its ſtrength.

But the cultivators in that part of the iſland, it it alleged, are lazy and indolent. To this it may be anſwered, that they are lazy and indolent for the ſame reaſon that ſlaves are lazy and indolent, from their daily experience that all their ſweat and all their labour go only to fill another man's pocket, and turn to no account to themſelves. Such a conſequence damps their exertions; and ſince they have no proſpect but of continuing poor, many of them prefer, *molles in gramine ſomnos*, ſoft ſlumbers on the graſs, to active induſtry that would yield them no profit. But that they are not, in general, naturally indolent, but of a character the very reverſe, appears from the following circumſtance, recorded by ſeveral of the ſtatiſtical writers, that great numbers of them annually undertake temporary emigrations from home of 100 or 200 miles in order to get employment. Can any thing give a greater proof of the love of induſtry of theſe poor labourers, and of ſome great miſgovernment and oppreſſion exiſting at home on the part of their landlords? If thoſe landlords would but reflect upon thoſe emigrations, they would perceive that the diſgrace of them recoils wholly upon themſelves. Were hundreds of country labourers annually to quit Kent and go into Devonſhire for employment, or if country labourers were to make ſhort emigrations from Connecticut to Virginia to get work,

would

would it not be concluded that the cultivation of land met with ſome particular diſcouragement from the land owners of Kent and Connecticut. For a farm, under proper management and ſkilfully cultivated, ought to give employment to labourers the whole year round. Land owners, therefore, who are inſtrumental in the temporary emigration of their country labourers, are, in fact, contributing in ſo far to the diminution of their own incomes. But when they compel them by ungenerous treatment to a perpetual emigration to a foreign country, they contract a high degree of culpability in reſpect to the community at large. The ſlothful man apologizes for his indolence by ſaying, there is a lion in the way; but were many of the farmers in thoſe parts to be reproached with the miſerable cultivation of their fields, they would have a moſt ſolid excuſe in ſaying there is a landlord in the way. They might juſtly plead, we have no property in our farms; we are in continual dread of being diſpoſſeſſed; were we to attempt improvements, ſome avaricious neighbour, who offered a ſmall riſe of rent, would be preferred to us. Theſe are diſcouragements which ſink us, and are ſtrong inducements to us to quit our native country. But we do not love to forſake our relations and friends, if we could get land to cultivate upon terms that would afford us a proſpect of enjoying the fruits of our induſtry. As the ſtate, by our oppreſſion, is a very great ſufferer as well as ourſelves, government is therefore, for its own ſake as well as ours, bound to eſtabliſh a law founded on the principles of juſtice,

tice, by which we may be ſecured, that the more we improve our farms, where we were born, and which we love to occupy, the more we ſhall enrich ourſelves. Give us but ſuch ſecurity, and the improvements of our farms, and the embelliſhment of the country will in a ſhort time prove that we are neither lazy nor unintelligent. We will then willingly participate our gains with our landlords, which will put it in their power to contribute much more largely to the defence of the ſtate, while we ourſelves, by bettering our circumſtances, will be enabled to rear up new families, and to become greater cuſtomers to the manufacturers and merchants.

As the procuring the greateſt quantity of produce from its lands will ever be a principal object with every wiſe government, and as that greateſt quantity of produce cannot be procured from the lands of Great Britain, while the farmers are diſcouraged from improvements by want of leaſes, a grievance, not confined to one corner of the iſland alone, but pervading almoſt every county in the kingdom, it becomes, therefore, the duty of the legiſlature to impoſe a penalty upon thoſe who thus obſtruct the proſperity of the nation by not granting leaſes to their farmers; and that penalty would very properly be an additional land-tax, of ſix-pence in the pound, upon all lands not cultivated, under a leaſe of at leaſt twenty years duration.

Should ſuch a penalty have the happy effect of aboliſhing the great political evil, which now inflicts barrenneſs upon our lands, it may be preſumed the

the land owners would immediately from the change feel a benefit in their rents of two millions ſterling annually, reckoning the cultivated acres in Great Britain at only 40 millions, and ſuppoſing a riſe of rent of one ſhilling per acre, upon a general introduction of leaſes. And if the land owners would be thereby benefited two millions, the national benefit thence reſulting, may conſequently be computed at four times that ſum. In point merely of profit, can the revenues of a Bengal, naturally precarious, be compared to ſuch an eaſy and permanent acquiſition within the circuit of our own ſeas. An expedient ſomewhat ſimilar to what is above propoſed was adopted by an anceſtor of the preſent King of Sardinia, who wiſhing to introduce a moſt material agricultural improvement in his dominions in Italy, impoſed a particular tax upon the lands in Piedmont; but exempted from the tax all thoſe landlords who planted upon their eſtates a certain number of mulberry trees. To this judicious law Piedmont is at preſent indebted for its annual rich revenue from the production of ſilk; for the landlords, in order to exempt themſelves from the additional land tax, made haſte to plant the ſtipulated number of mulberry trees, by which, beſides greatly benefiting their country, they quickly added very conſiderably to their own rents.

The great difficulty of forming a proper leaſe, where the advantages ariſing from improvements may be ſhared proportionately between the tenant and the landlord, has probably been one of the chief cauſes why leaſes have been ſo neglected. This difficulty, however, being

being now happily removed by the great ingenuity of the late Lord Kaims, who has given a general form of a leaſe, ſuited to all poſſible caſes, publiſhed by Dr. Anderſon in his Agricultural Report for the county of Aberdeen, and which I have added in an Appendix to my preſent diſcourſe, it may therefore be expected that landlords will at length advert to the annual loſſes they ſuſtain by not granting leaſes to their farmers, and will perceive the advantages that would accrue to themſelves and the nation by cultivating their eſtates by farmers excited to induſtry by equitable leaſes.

As men by their nature are intended to be cultivators of the ground, the more equally, therefore, they are diſtributed over its ſurface, the greater, in all likelihood, will be their proſperity. On this account the Economiſts exceedingly condemn the aggregating or crowding of men, without neceſſity, by twenty thouſands, and thirty thouſands, in towns and cities, and urge it as an indiſpenſible duty of government to take ſuch meaſures as may ſpread population in an equal degree over the whole territory it ſuperintends, in order that men may never be far ſeparated from the ſource from whence, as has been demonſtrated, the chief of his ſubſiſtence and of his wealth is to originate.

There is no territory on the globe where this principle may with more propriety be reduced to practice than in this happy iſland of Great Britain; and it is a circumſtance worth noting, that our anceſtors two thouſand years ago, ſeem to have acted upon this principle from a conviction of its propriety and ſuitableneſs

ableneſs to the territory which they occupied. Julius Cæſar, in his wars on the neighbouring continent of Gaul, was employed for ſix or ſeven years, not only in fighting many battles, but beſieging many populous cities, ſo ſtrongly fortified by art as to ſeem to bid defiance to any aſſailant. But in Great Britain, at the ſame time, from his own account of it, neither walled town nor walled city ſeems to have exiſted, though in comparative populouſneſs it appears not to have been deficient; for the infinite number of men, *hominum infinita multitudo*, which he met with in Britain, was particularly noticed by him. Indeed, this hominum infinita multitudo, or infinite number of men, is more likely to be met with in a country inhabited, without towns and cities, than in a country abounding with them; for, as in cities and towns, in general, more die than are born, their multiplicity muſt, therefore, rather retard population than forward it.

The dread of hoſtility, and the hopes of ſecurity againſt blood-thirſty and vagrant plunderers, were probably the motives that firſt drove men into walled towns, and while theſe motives were continually operating among the ſmall ſovereignties into which the continent was then divided, a ſpirit of good neighbourhood and mutual kindneſs ſeems to have prevailed among the ſmall ſovereignties into which Britain was at that time divided, and happily rendered walled towns to them unneceſſary. A ſenſe of general ſecurity againſt a foreign invader ſeems to have inſpired the Britons with a ſenſe of individual ſecurity, and with the natural concomitant of that, a predominant

predominant paſſion for rural habitation ; and this paſſion ſo conſonant to nature, has deſcended through ſucceſſive generations to Britons of modern times, even in ſpite of the falſe policy of late years, which has given too much countenance to the augmentation of towns, from a notion that manufactures could not be properly carried on elſewhere. On the Continent, on the other hand, the natural paſſion for rural habitation has through ſucceſſive ages continued to be in a great meaſure ſtifled from the want of ſecurity that has always prevailed ; and one meets there not only with walled cities and walled towns, but even with walled villages.

Great Britain is now happily One and Indiviſible, conſequently its inhabitants, who when they lived in different ſovereignties did not find cities and towns neceſſary, are at preſent much leſs under any neceſſity of crowding into cities and towns, from motives of defence and ſecurity. Bands of ravagers are here unknown ; and individual plunderers would probably be leſs frequent, were they to exchange the wants and diſtreſſes of a town life for the eaſily acquired competence, which honeſt induſtry would procure by cultivating the ground.

If cities and towns in the inland parts of Great Britain are not required for defence, a little conſideration will ſerve to ſhew that they are not in general required for manufactures. We obſerve manufactures of great extent and great ingenuity at this day carried on in villages. What, then, is to hinder all manufactures of the ſame kind from being carried on the ſame manner, and in many caſes, even in detached

tached hamlets. Amid all the variety of curious manufactures now carried on in Birmingham, there is hardly any one kind, that is not as completely manufactured by Mr. Bolton, in his great manufactory, at Soho, within two miles of that town, many of whose workmen, when their day's work is finished, retiring to detached hamlets on the adjoining common. If village workmen at Soho furnish the most curious hardware, we find village workmen, likewise, from the hamlets round Tunbridge Wells, furnishing the elegant cabinet work so much admired under the name of Tunbridge Ware. It is village workmen who fabricate the great variety of iron work at the very extensive manufactory at Carron. Of the great numbers of mills for spinning cotton now existing in Great Britain, many have by preference been erected in villages. In the nicest part of the linen branch, namely, damask weaving, not a few of the most skilful manufacturers are to be found in villages. Without specifying more particulars, these may suffice to shew that the great mass of manufactures may be executed by workmen not resident in towns; and from hence it follows, that it would be a true policy in Great Britain to check the augmentation of inland towns, since neither defence nor manufactures require such towns.

It is taking but a half view of things, to say, that towns give employment to the farmers; for if all those who are now workers in towns were to become workers in the country; and in general there is no natural impediment to such a transition, they would not be less consumers of the produce of the soil than at present;

preſent; and the ſame may be ſaid of idlers in towns, were they to prefer a reſidence in the country. The probability rather is, that in ſuch a ſtate of population, both the produce of the ſoil would be greater, and the conſumption greater; for in towns the ſituation of many journeymen labourers is ſuch as prevents them from marrying, and leads them to ſpend many of their non-working hours in ſkittle-grounds or in ale houſes; whereas, if thoſe journeymen were to be ſettled in the country, with a garden adjoining to their houſe, more of them would be induced to marry, and would find delight in their hours of relaxation, in cultivating their garden, or inſtructing their children. Agriculture, the fountain of our wealth, would thus get a recruit of two hundred thouſand new cultivators, who were they to beſtow but one hour a day in field labour, would thereby more benefit the nation, than by ſix hours employed by them in manufactures. Were even great numbers of them to quit manufactures altogether, and to employ themſelves in agriculture, the greater ſtill would be the advantage to the nation; for the preſent overabundance of manufactures on one hand, and over great ſcarcity of products on the other, plainly ſhews that too many labourers are employed in the manufacturing line, and too few labourers in the agricultural line. For example, were all the cutlers in Great Britain to be idle for a couple of years, the ſtock in the ſhops gives reaſon to preſume, that the buyers of ſciſſars, knives, razors, &c. would during that time experience no deficiency of ſupply; and the ſame may be concluded in regard to ſome

other articles of manufacture, which the makers are frequently preſſing upon the buyers at a twelve-months credit, or an eighteen months credit, a plain proof that the market is overſtocked with ſuch commodities, ſince the ſellers of them are fain to give a premium of 6 or 7 per cent to have them taken off their hands.

How different is the ſtate of the products of agriculture, particularly of the important article of corn! The annual ſupply of that article, in its greateſt abundance, for theſe 50 years paſt, has never yielded a ſurplus of three months ſubſiſtence above the annual conſumption. Nay, within theſe two years, the annual conſumption in the article of grain has experienced a deficiency of ſupply of three months; ſo that if corn had not been brought from abroad, the whole nation muſt have been put for twelve months upon a ſhort allowance of bread, with a daily diminution of one fourth of the uſual quantity. The evident conſequence of this ſeems to be, that the people of Great Britain for a long time paſt have gone too much into manufactures, which when ſold at home produce no national income; and have beſtowed too little attention upon agriculture, which in ſome caſes has yielded the vaſt increaſe of 10,500 per cent and of which ſome of the products are as capable of being ſtored and preſerved for years, as ſome articles of manufacture are.

The commons that require to be divided, and the waſte lands that would admit of further improvement, are computed to amount in Great Britain to 22 millions of acres, which is more than one

fourth

fourth of the whole territory. Theſe to be properly cultivated would give employment to 200,000 new families, and ſubſiſtence to twice that number; and how can they be expected to be properly cultivated unleſs inhabitants reſide upon them. But beſides theſe commons and waſte lands, the lands at preſent under cultivation would require many thouſands of new cultivators, in order to advance them to their higheſt degree of improvement.

To accompliſh this higheſt degree of improvement of our ſoil, the Economiſts affirm, that inland towns are ſo far from being neceſſary, that they even obſtruct it, and that the wealth and opulence of the nation would be very quickly advanced, were the hands that thoſe towns have withdrawn from agriculture to be diſtributed as cultivators over the whole iſland, wherever there was occaſion for the ſpade or the plow.

The proportionate diſtribution of the people over the ſurface of the territory, while it greatly increaſed the real and ſubſtantial revenue or wealth of the kingdom, would neither prejudice manufacturing induſtry, nor general morals. We have ſeen above, that in this iſland moſt extenſive branches of manufacture are carried on in villages; and as by this diſtribution of the cultivators, ſubſiſtence would be rendered more abundant, and conſequently cheaper, manufacturers would thereby naturally be drawn to intermix themſelves with them in every corner of the kingdom.

In regard to general morals it by no means follows, that if in the inland counties of Great Britain

there were no towns beſides the county town, that either ruſticity or immorality would prevail. In a Chriſtian country every pariſh church is a centre of civilization. Chriſtianity, in regard to its practical duties, is only the perfection of humanity; and whoever will attend his church, and aſſiduouſly practice the precepts there recommended, will neither be deficient in good morals nor in good manners. He may not have the deceitful varniſh of the late Lord Cheſterfield's whited ſepulchre, but he will have the poliſh of the mind, which will infallibly give him a civil demeanour.

The proportionate diſtribution of the people over the territory would likewiſe be the means of preventing innumerable expences that now detract conſiderably from the nation's proſperity, I mean the carriage of ſubſiſtence from the place where it is produced to the place where it is conſumed, and of raw materials from their place of production to the place where they are manufactured; and of manufactures from the places where they are fabricated to the places where they are vended. In conſequence of the preſent impolitic ſyſtem of people's cluſtering without neceſſity into large cities, or even into particular counties (for Lancaſhire, we are told, contains more people than it can nouriſh), cattle reared in one place are driven 300 or 400 miles to be ſlaughtered in another place; wool that grows in a ſouthern county is carried 200 miles to be manufactured in a northern county; and when manufactured is carried many hundred miles in order to be ſold. Theſe and ſimilar inſtances that might be produced, give employment

ployment to a great number of waggons upon our public roads, and this tranſport buſineſs paſſes with many for a lucrative commerce, when it is in fact a diminution of the national profit, nearly to the amount of what it coſts. If woollen manufactures, by being fabricated where the wool is produced, were to be exempted from this charge of double tranſport, they might be bought at lower prices both by domeſtic and foreign purchaſers, which would promote the national proſperity. If Lancaſhire contains more people than it can nouriſh, we ought to conclude from thence, either that the cultivation of that county is not brought to its higheſt degree of improvement, or that the county is too populous, in which laſt caſe, it would be a national advantage, if the ſupernumerary inhabitants were to remove to ſome other part of the iſland, where there is a deficiency of population, and a ſuperfluity of ſubſiſtence. The cattle that are now driven at a conſiderable expence 300 or 400 miles to be ſlaughtered, might more profitably to the nation be conſumed near the ſpots where they are reared, were thoſe ſpots to have their proportionate ſhare of cultivators and manufacturers.

Although large cities and large towns in the inland parts of Great Britain may juſtly be conſidered as detracting from the nations proſperity, they would however have a direct contrary effect when ſituated upon the coaſts of the iſland. As much as villages and detached hamlets ought to be preferred in the interior of the iſland, ſo much ought walled cities

and walled towns to be encouraged upon its coaſts, and at the mouths of its navigable rivers. There, and there only, walled cities and walled towns ought to be as numerous as poſſible, on many accounts, but principally for the three following reaſons.

Firſt, numerous walled towns upon its coaſts would be the means of promoting and extending foreign commerce, which though no great ſource of income, compared with agriculture, yet when conducted with prudence, may add ſomething to the enjoyments as well as to the riches of the inhabitants.

Secondly, numerous walled towns upon the coaſts would contribute greatly to the increaſe of the fiſhery, that golden mine to thoſe who proſecute it with ſkill and induſtry. The Britiſh ſeas are an undivided common, remarkable for its great fertility, and they who cultivate this common, namely, fiſhermen, ought naturally to have their habitations on the edge of it. As it would be abſurd to expect a conſtant reſident in a large town to be a farmer, ſo it would be equally abſurd to expect the inhabitant remote from the coaſt to be a fiſherman. How many thouſands in this iſland follow a marine life hardly for any other reaſon but becauſe they have been born and bred within ſight of the ſea. Were the number of thoſe in Great Britain born and bred within ſight of the ſea, to be then twenty times as great as it is at preſent, it might be expected that thoſe following a marine life would alſo be twenty times as numerous. In proportion to the harveſt, ſo ſhould be the reapers. Since the Britiſh ſeas can furniſh twenty times the wealth or ſub-

ſiſtence

ſiſtence that is at preſent extracted from them, it will therefore be a prudent policy in the government of Britain to adopt ſuch means as may augment the number of thoſe following a marine life twenty fold. And what policy could ſo much augment the number of thoſe who follow a marine life, as to induce a million more of inhabitants to reſide on the ſea coaſts, by giving every encouragement to multiply maritime cities. The Penſionary De Witt, in his Political Maxims, p. 35, computes the number of the people in the United Provinces at 2,400,000, and of theſe he reckons 450,000 *earn their living by the fiſheries at ſea, and ſetting them out with ſhips, rigging, caſks, ſalt, and other materials or inſtruments, and the traffic that depends thereon.* In another place he ſays, *more than the one half of the trade of Holland would decay, in caſe the trade of fiſh were deſtroyed.* In a population of 2,400,000 ſouls, 450,000 make near a fifth part, and in that proportion the number of people in Great Britain depending for a ſubſiſtence upon the fiſhing buſineſs, and what relates to it ought to amount to near two millions, were the views of government, and the views of individuals, turned as earneſtly to that great object in Britain as they are in Holland, and that they are not ſo turned, is no ſmall reproach to the policy of this iſland; for what has maintained this fifth part of the inhabitants of Holland, has been drawn from ſeas properly belonging to Great Britain; or from ſeas ſituated more conveniently for Britiſh fiſhermen, han for Dutch fiſhermen; and capable of main-

taining ten times more people than who now draw their ſubſiſtence from them. Had Britain even but a ſmall ſea frontier to improve, the neglect of improving it, though not of great conſequence, would ſtill be a blameable policy. But Great Britain, including Ireland, (which I mean to be included in all that is ſaid, or ſhall be ſaid in this diſcourſe) has the advantage of a ſea frontier of upwards of 3000 miles, and of ſeas waſhing that frontier, affording ſubſiſtence for millions of men, were thoſe millions to be induced by political regulations to cultivate them. Should a rich proprietor poſſeſs an immenſe plain of great fertility to the extent of 30,000 or 40,000 acres, where the herbage, as in ſome places of Hungary, riſes to the heighth of five or ſix feet, and ſhould he nevertheleſs keep neither bullock nor horſe upon it, nor any live ſtock whatever, it would be concluded by the ſenſible and judicious, that ſuch proprietor had not his eyes open to his own intereſt. But muſt not the ſame thing be concluded of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, who continue to give ſo little attention to the watery plain with which they are ſurrounded, though an hundred times more to be valued on account of the wealth it would afford, than ſuch a plain as is above mentioned.

The firſt and moſt natural ſtep to the improvement of this watery plain is by encouragements to bring multitudes of men to live within view of it; for it is hardly poſſible for multitudes of men to live conſtantly within view of it, without a great part of

of them forming ſuch a connection with it, as may procure them, if not opulence, at leaſt a ſubſiſtence. Were the propoſition of founding either a ſecond Birmingham or a ſecond Liverpool to be deliberated upon, true policy would decidedly declare in favour of the new Liverpool, becauſe all the arts, trades, and manufactures carried on in Birmingham, or in any inland town whatever, might juſt as conveniently be carried on in the new maritime city, with the addition of the trades that ſeafaring buſineſs creates.

But inſtead of one new Liverpool, the ſea frontier of Great Britain and Ireland would admit of twenty new Liverpools, which ſo far from diminiſhing the national population, would contribute greatly to augment it. How many vacant and deſart ſpots are there at preſent on the ſhores of theſe iſlands, where ſuch new maritime cities might conveniently be founded, were Government to make it an object of its attention to mark out ſuch ſpots, and give encouragement to new ſettlers to inhabit them. The ſituations for ſuch new maritime cities ought not to be haſtily choſen, nor fixed upon entirely upon the report of military engineers. Civil engineers ought alſo to be conſulted, and the reports of both to be compared and weighed. The great abundance of fiſh ought to be a leading motive for fixing the ſituation of many of the new maritime cities in their vicinity, and ſuch is that abundance in our north-weſtern ſeas, that a city of 8,000 or 10,000 inhabitants might be ſupported by fiſhing,

fiſhing, and the commerce depending upon it, on many of the now half inhabited iſlands on the weſt coaſt of Scotland*.

Building in theſe new maritime cities might probably ſoon become a profitable ſpeculation, as government, it may be hoped, will ere long have a happy opportunity of colonizing them with 150,000 or 200,000 men, who by changing their ſwords and cutlaſſes for plows and fiſhing nets, may add to the wealth of the country, and at the ſame time may continue to add to its ſtrength.

The public encouragements to theſe new ſettlers may be various. Were the tax upon bricks, uſed in their buildings, to be remitted to them, the general amount of that tax would probably thereby not be diminiſhed. The ſame might be ſaid of the general amount of the houſe-tax, and of the win-

* In the northern counties and iſlands of Scotland are reckoned 4,528,000, and the population in 1795 was computed to be 137,754 ſouls, which is near 38 acres to each individual, or about 20 ſouls to a ſquare mile. In the kingdom of Naples the general population is reckoned to give 203 ſouls to a ſquare mile, ſupported by the fertility of the territory. The land in the north part of Scotland is grealy inferior to that of the kingdom of Naples in point of fertility; but this inferiority is fully compenſated by the ſuperior fertility of the ſeas in furniſhing ſubſiſtence to man; therefore the improvement of the fiſheries by the eſtabliſhment of large maritime towns may render the lands in thoſe parts of the iſland capable of ſupporting a population equal to that of the kingdom of Naples, that is, would increaſe the number of their inhabitants to near a million and an half, and the value of the lands in a proportionable degree.

dow-tax,

dow-tax, were the new ſettlers to be exempted from thoſe taxes for ten years. Premiums might likewiſe be beſtowed on thoſe who built or navigated boats or veſſels of a certain tonnage, or ſpun twine to a certain quantity.

Theſe indulgencies, without being at all burdenſome to government, or ſenſibly diminiſhing the general ſum total of the taxes, would be moſt alluring inducements to draw inhabitants to the new ſettlements, who by directing their induſtry without delay to fiſhing, and the ſeafaring buſineſs dependant upon it, would as aſſuredly acquire an income as if they were to become farmers in any county of Great Britain. They ought for the firſt years to receive every prudential ſupport, which, in the ſucceſſion of time, they would moſt amply repay to the nation. Though an orchard does not yield any fruit ſufficient to defray the expence of forming it, till ſeveral years after it is planted, yet that does not deter the prudent huſbandman from incurring that expence. In like manner though theſe new ſettlements ſhould for ſome years yield little return in point of taxes, yet the prudent ſtateſman will not refuſe to them his foſtering care, knowing that, with proper management, their natural advantages will enable them not only to ſubſiſt, but to acquire opulence, and conſequently to be large contributors to the public ſupply. There was a time when the immenſe capitals poſſeſſed by the wealthy inhabitants of Liverpool, Newcaſtle, Glaſgow, &c. did not exiſt; but in the ſame manner as theſe capitals have been created, ſo might capitals be formed in

the new maritime cities, ſince they would be equally favoured by the ocean as Liverpool, Newcaſtle, or Glaſgow. How have the capitals of our great Weſt Indian planters been formed but by producing with great labour, and ſending to market an article of very general conſumption? But fiſh is a commodity not of more limited conſumption than ſugar, with this ſuperior advantage, that beſides the foreign ſale, it actually makes great part of the ſubſiſtence of thoſe who produce it and ſend it to market. As the market for both is daily increaſing, colonizing on our own coaſts may be found to be as true policy as colonizing in the Weſt Indies.

A third principal reaſon for multiplying cities and towns upon our coaſts is, that they would in ſuch ſituations add much more eſſentially both to the defenſive and offenſive ſtrength of the nation. I have ſaid that Great Britain and Ireland have the advantage of a ſea frontier upwards of 3,000 miles in extent; but while this frontier ſhall remain but thinly occupied by inhabitants, it will be more conſonant to truth to ſay, Great Britain and Ireland have the diſadvantage of a ſea frontier upwards of 3,000 miles in extent, becauſe from this very extent a foreign invader may aſſail them in a greater number of points. But were a foreign invader to know, that he could no where land within 100 miles of the ſeat of government of either iſland, without having a populous and regularly fortified city to attack, or without having within 20 miles of him two ſuch cities on the coaſt, that could each ſend out a military force of 10,000 men, we may be almoſt

moſt ſure, that a fleet could hardly be wanted for the defence of ſuch a coaſt, or at leaſt it may be affirmed, that a coaſt ſo peopled and ſo fortified, would be twice as formidable to a foreign enemy, as if left unpeopled and unfortified to the protection of a fleet alone.

Independent then of the extenſion of foreign commerce, and of the extenſion of the fiſhery, the cheap defence of the kingdom calls loudly for the multiplication of maritime cities of great populouſneſs and great ſtrength. It is hardly in the nature of things that ſuch cities ſhould be filled with idlers; and the example of Holland ſhews us that where manufacturing and commercial induſtry prevails, one great and populous city does not prevent another great and populous city from thriving within twenty miles of it, nay ſometimes within ten miles. In this view it may be affirmed, that two new Liverpools might ariſe on the coaſt of Eſſex, between Harwich and South End, at the mouth of the Thames, and twice as many on the coaſts of Kent and Suſſex. Theſe, when ſtrongly fortified, would be moſt powerful outguards to the metropolis; and it may be preſumed that in the policy of having ſuch outguards originated the privileges conferred upon the cinque ports, which in former ages, during the weak ſtate of the naval force of Europe, well acquitted themſelves by their ſervices to the public. But inſtead of having only cinque ports, or five ſea ports, true policy in theſe modern times demands that Great Britain and Ireland ſhould have an hundred ſea ports, or maritime

cities, flouriſhing in populouſneſs, and ſo fortified as to bid defiance to a ſudden attack of an invading enemy. In the new maritime cities, founded on the coaſts of Eſſex, Kent, and Suſſex, might be carried on to greater national advantage many branches of manufacture and ſeafaring buſineſs, now moſt unneceſſarily eſtabliſhed in London and its vicinity. As neither corn nor coals are ſtaples of the port of London, it is a heedleſs policy to ſuffer diſtilleries, iron founderies, fire engines, and other works and undertakings that require a great conſumption of fuel to be concentered in the capital, as though they could proſper no where but on the banks of the Thames. All theſe, inſtead of being crowded into London, ſhould ſtudiouſly be removed from it, and might be carried on as profitably for the proprietors, if not more profitably, on the ſhores of Eſſex, Kent, and Suſſex. Thither likewiſe a great part of the ſhip building buſineſs, that may now be ſaid to encumber the river Thames, might with national advantage be transferred. And with national advantage likewiſe the overgrown metropolis with its neighbourhood could ſpare thouſands and ten thouſands for the peopling of theſe new cities, which might alſo attract great numbers of inhabitants with large capitals from the oppoſite continent, were the impolitic reſtrictions againſt foreigners to be removed, and ſucceeded by invitations. Men of mercantile enterpriſe are often of more conſequence to the aggrandiſement and proſperity of a commercial city, than even a good ſituation or a good harbour. What then might be expected

pected were these three circumstances to be united; and to all appearance it remains only with our legislature to unite them. Nature has already given us the two former, and were our legislature to invite foreigners to settle in those cities, by the offer of naturalization, thousands of them would probably prefer the security and quiet to be obtained on the shores of Great Britain, to the insecurity and oppression to which they are but too often exposed on the continent.

But without enlarging further, my readers may easily figure to themselves, from the preceding illustrations, what would be the natural and happy consequence of the establishment of the system of the Economists, in respect to Great Britain and Ireland. The lands of both islands would be cultivated under leases upon the model of that of Lord Kaimes, by which the farmers would be excited to increase the national produce in the full security of augmenting their own incomes. Manufacturers, without expecting any income from them, would be cherished on account of the multiplied conveniences arising from them. Taxes upon consumption would in general be abolished; and the supply for national defence would, as formerly, be drawn directly from the national income by a single tax upon the surplus of that income, possessed by the land proprietors. What alone sustains the whole of the people would be allowed to suffice for sustaining the defenders of the people, who, when defenders, do not cease to make part of that whole. The real resources of the nation would be understood by the ge-

generality of the people to conſiſt in the productions of the ſoil, and not in ſtampt paper, which would animate their zeal to favour the increaſe of thoſe productions. Abundance would be attended with its natural conſequence cheapneſs, and cheapneſs would greatly extend the circle of our foreign commerce. Gold and ſilver would become the general medium of circulation, and few families be without ſome reſerve of them, either in coin or in plate. The hamlets and villages would be ſo multiplied in the interior parts, that in every county a traveller would never loſe ſight of one habitation before he might ſee another, each the ſeat of induſtry, and many of them the nurſeries of numerous and healthy children; and the ſea frontier would be every where ſpiked, or, in the French idiom, *briſtled* with large and populous cities, abounding with fiſhermen, ſailors, and artiſts of every kind, and ſo fortified with rampart and ditch, as to bid defiance to the ſudden attack of a foreign invader.

APPENDIX.

A GENERAL PLAN OF A LEASE

BY

LORD KAIMS,

WITH

SOME REMARKS UPON IT BY DR. ANDERSON,

IN HIS

AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR THE COUNTY OF ABERDEEN.

I AM extremely happy to have it in my power on this occaſion to lay before the public at large, through means of the Honourable Board, to whom this report is addreſſed, a plan of a leaſe which is perfectly adapted to ſecure alike the intereſt of the tenant, and the legitimate rights of the landlord; by which the rights of humanity can never be violated, and which can apply to all poſſible caſes, ſo that neither of the parties can ever acquire an undue advantage over the other in any ſituation of things. To effect all theſe things appeared to me, for a great many years, to exceed the powers of human ingenuity to deviſe. It has been done; and the public are obliged to the late Lord Kaims for this excellent device.

His lordſhip propoſed that the leaſe ſhould extend to an indefinite number of years conſiſting of fixed periods, at the end of each of which a riſe of rent ſhould take place, with permiſſion for the tenant, at the period of each of theſe riſes of rent, to give up his farm, if he ſhall ſee proper, and granting a ſimilar power to the landlord, upon proper terms, to reſume his land if he ſhall think fit. The particulars of this contract, and the grounds on which they reſt, are as under:

He aſſumes it as a poſtulatum that a landlord and tenant are capable of forming a tolerably juſt eſtimate of the value of land in queſtion for a ſhort period of years, ſuch as it is cuſtomary to grant leaſes for in Scotland: ſay 21 years. And having agreed upon theſe terms, which for the preſent we ſhall call 100l. rent, the tenant expreſſes a wiſh to have his leaſe extended to a longer period. To this the proprietor objects, on this ground, that it is not poſſible to form a preciſe eſtimate of what the value of the ground may be at the end of that period. He has already ſeen that ground, for the laſt 21 years, has increaſed much more in value than any perſon at the beginning of that period could eaſily have conceived it would have done, and therefore he cannot think of giving it off juſt now for a longer period, as a ſimilar riſe in value may be expected to take place in future. This reaſoning appears to be well founded, and therefore to give the landlord a reaſonable gratification, he propoſes that it ſhould be ſtipulated that if the tenant ſhould agree to give a certain riſe of rent, at the end of that pe-

riod, ſuppoſe 20l. the landlord ſhould conſent that the leaſe ſhould run on for another period of 21 years; unleſs in the caſes to be after mentioned.

But as it may happen that this 20l. now ſtipulated to be paid at ſo diſtant a period, may be more than the farmer will find he is able to pay, an option ſhall be given to him to reſign his leaſe, if he ſhould find that is the caſe, by giving the landlord legal notice, one year at leaſt, before the expiration of the leaſe; but if that notice be omitted thus to be given, it ſhall be underſtood that the tenant is bound to hold the leaſe for the ſecond 21 years, at the rent ſpecified in the contract. And if the landlord does not give the tenant warning within one month after the period, it ſhall be underſtood that he too is bound to accept of the ſtipulated additional rent for the 21 years that are to ſucceed.

It may however alſo happen that the ſum ſpecified in the leaſe may be a rent conſiderably below the then preſent value of the farm; or the proprietor may have very ſtrong reaſons for wiſhing to reſume the poſſeſſion of that land, or to obtain an adequate rent for it: a power therefore ſhould be given to him, in either caſe, to reſume the lands, if he ſhould ſo incline. But as a great part of that preſent value may be owing to the exertions of the farmer, who has laid out money upon the farm, in hopes to enjoy it for a ſecond period of 21 years, it would be unjuſt to deprive him of this benefit, without giving him a valuable conſideration for that improved value. On this account it ſhould be ſtipulated, that in caſe the proprietor at this time

reſume the farm, he ſhall become bound to pay to the tenant ten years purchaſe of the additional rent he had agreed to pay; which in the example above ſtated would be 200l.

But the land may be worth ſtill more than the 20l. of riſe mentioned in the leaſe, and the tenant may be content to pay more, ſay 10l. rather than remove, and he makes offer accordingly to do ſo. In that caſe the landlord ſhould be bound either to accept that additional offer, or to pay *ten* years purchaſe for that alſo; and ſo on for every other offer the tenant ſhall make, before he agrees to move from the farm.

In this way the landlord is always certain that he can never be precluded from obtaining the full value for his land, whatever circumſtances may ariſe. And if the tenant ſhall prove diſagreeable, ſo that he would wiſh rather to put another in his place upon the ſame terms, it never can be any hardſhip upon the landlord to pay the ſtipulated ſum; becauſe it would be the ſame thing to him as if he bought a new eſtate at ten years purchaſe, free of taxes: a thing he can never expect to do. It is indeed true that it would be more advantageous for him to allow the preſent tenant to continue; and therefore this alternative will be always, unleſs in very extraordinary caſes, accepted of, as it ever ought to be; and thus the tenant's mind is impreſſed with a conviction that he will continue in his poſſeſſion: a conviction that ought ever to prevail, becauſe it ſtimulates to induſtry in the higheſt degree. And as the tenant is thus certain that, at the very worſt, his family muſt be entitled to

draw

draw a reaſonable remuneration for the exertions of his induſtry, he can never find the ſmalleſt tendency to ſlacken his endeavours in any way.

By ſtipulating in the original leaſe in the ſame manner, that at the end of the ſecond 21 years, the leaſe ſhall be continued for 21 years more, and ſo on at the end of the third, and fourth, and any farther numbers of periods of 21 years, on agreeing to pay a ſpecified riſe of rent; reſerving to each party the ſame privileges as above deſcribed, the leaſe might be continued to perpetuity, without either party ever being in danger of having an undue advantage over the other. The tenant will always be certain of having a preference given him over every other perſon, and will of courſe go on with unceaſing exertions to better his land, which will of neceſſity tend to augment the income of the proprietor much more than could have happened under any other ſyſtem of management.

Such are the outlines of that plan of a leaſe his Lordſhip has propoſed. By this plan the tenant's hands are not tied up by reſtrictive clauſes dictated by ignorance, under the pretext of ſecuring the intereſt of the landlord. His intereſt is ſecured in a much more effectual manner, while the tenant is left at full liberty to avail himſelf of his knowledge, his ſkill, and his induſtry. Inſtead of ceaſing to begin any arduous undertaking, as he ever muſt do where he has no leaſe, or of beginning to improve for a few years only at the commencement of his leaſe, but ſtopping in a ſhort while in the midſt of his career, and then running it down

to

to the same exhausted state as it was at its commencement, he continues to push forward without ever stopping, and advances even with an accelerated progress for an endless period of years. No person but an experienced farmer can conceive the difference that would be between the productiveness of the same land under this management, at the end of an hundred years, from what it would have been if let even for detached periods of 21 years each. In unimproved waste lands, the difference would approach to infinity. In lands which were originally very rich, the difference would be less considerable; but in all cases where cultivation could take place the difference would be very great. It is worth remarking here also, that if this arrangement were adopted, a new order of men in civil society would be created, different from any that at present exists. They would be inferior in point of rank to that class of men who are called *gentlemen*; and superior in point of wealth and energy, not only to the present order of *farmers*, but even to that class of men who are called *yeomen*. The peculiar political advantage attached to this order of society would be, that while their exertions would always insure affluence, that affluence never would become such as to permit them, by imitating the life of the higher orders, to neglect their own proper concerns; for the moment they did so, their exertions in business would become slackened, in consequence of which they could not afford such a rent as others around them would be willing to give, and so they must quit their lease.

Here

Here we are led to perceive the moſt eſſential difference between thus granting what may almoſt be called a perpetual leaſe, and every other *long* leaſe that ever yet has been tried; for in all other long leaſes, if the rent ſtipulated at firſt ſhall prove to be at laſt inadequate, and the holder of the leaſe be reduced to poverty, by diſſipation or otherwiſe, he may neither himſelf be able to cultivate the ground properly, nor can another be permitted to do ſo; and by this means the proprietor may not only be for a long period of years deprived of an adequate value for his land, but that land alſo being locked up from improvement, may be doomed long to remain in a degree of comparative ſterility. Nothing of that kind could here happen.

It differs alſo very much from that ſort of tenure which is called yeomanry, in which the ſmall capital, if properly applied, would have been juſt ſufficient to give ſcope for agricultural exertions, but by being locked up on the original purchaſe of the land, it deprives the poſſeſſor of the only funds he had in his power to apply for improving his land. Inſtead of active exertions, and chearful affluence through life, he is thus ſtinted in every exertion, and is doomed to a perpetual hard ſtruggle againſt the harraſſments of poverty.

In ſhort, were I either a proprietor or a tenant, I ſhould either let or take land upon theſe terms, in preference to any other I have ever heard of. Several little clauſes have been overlooked by his Lordſhip, which it would be neceſſary to advert to. Some proviſion ought to be made reſpecting trees on a leaſe

a leaſe of this kind, as it is probable the tenant might find it convenient to plant, which by the common law of Scotland he cannot do at preſent with a view to profit. Perhaps the wood, if any was on the farm at the time of his entry, ought to be valued, and he ſhould be bound to leave at leaſt an equal value upon it, or pay the balance. Whatever timber trees he himſelf had planted, he ſhould be at liberty to cut at pleaſure, for the uſe of the farm, unleſs it were ſuch individual trees as the landlord, from ſituation or other cauſes, ſhould think proper to mark for reſervation. He ſhould alſo have permiſſion to ſell ſuch trees as he inclined, unleſs as above reſerved, or during the laſt ſix years of any of the 21 years of the leaſe. But in caſe of his removal, the proprietor ſhall either permit him the whole of the trees that was over the value of the ſtock at his entry, or take the whole, or ſuch part as he choſe to reſerve, at an appreciated value. In caſe of his removal alſo the tenant ſhould be bound not to outlabour the ground, during the laſt ſix years of the leaſe, or to crop it improperly, or to carry off any ſtraw or dung: otherwiſe to pay the damages that ſhould thus accrue to the landlord, at the eſtimate of two honeſt men, to be mutually choſen; and to leave the houſes in a habitable condition, and the fences in good repair. There ſeems to be no other clauſe neceſſary in ſuch a leaſe.

FINIS.